

# Rehabilitation time has greater influences on soil mechanical composition and erodibility than does land type in the hilly-gully region of the Loess Plateau, China (#37265)

1

First submission

## Guidance from your Editor

Please submit by **14 Jun 2019** for the benefit of the authors (and your \$200 publishing discount).



### Structure and Criteria

Please read the 'Structure and Criteria' page for general guidance.



### Author notes

Have you read the author notes on the [guidance page](#)?



### Raw data check

Review the raw data. Download from the [materials page](#).



### Image check

Check that figures and images have not been inappropriately manipulated.

Privacy reminder: If uploading an annotated PDF, remove identifiable information to remain anonymous.

## Files

Download and review all files from the [materials page](#).

8 Figure file(s)

4 Table file(s)



# Structure and Criteria

## Structure your review

The review form is divided into 5 sections. Please consider these when composing your review:

1. BASIC REPORTING
2. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN
3. VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS
4. General comments
5. Confidential notes to the editor

 You can also annotate this PDF and upload it as part of your review

When ready [submit online](#).

## Editorial Criteria

Use these criteria points to structure your review. The full detailed editorial criteria is on your [guidance page](#).

### BASIC REPORTING

-  Clear, unambiguous, professional English language used throughout.
-  Intro & background to show context. Literature well referenced & relevant.
-  Structure conforms to [PeerJ standards](#), discipline norm, or improved for clarity.
-  Figures are relevant, high quality, well labelled & described.
-  Raw data supplied (see [PeerJ policy](#)).

### EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

-  Original primary research within [Scope of the journal](#).
-  Research question well defined, relevant & meaningful. It is stated how the research fills an identified knowledge gap.
-  Rigorous investigation performed to a high technical & ethical standard.
-  Methods described with sufficient detail & information to replicate.

### VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS

-  Impact and novelty not assessed. Negative/inconclusive results accepted. *Meaningful* replication encouraged where rationale & benefit to literature is clearly stated.
-  All underlying data have been provided; they are robust, statistically sound, & controlled.
-  Speculation is welcome, but should be identified as such.
-  Conclusions are well stated, linked to original research question & limited to supporting results.

# Standout reviewing tips

3



The best reviewers use these techniques

## Tip

**Support criticisms with evidence from the text or from other sources**

## Example

*Smith et al (J of Methodology, 2005, V3, pp 123) have shown that the analysis you use in Lines 241-250 is not the most appropriate for this situation. Please explain why you used this method.*

**Give specific suggestions on how to improve the manuscript**

*Your introduction needs more detail. I suggest that you improve the description at lines 57- 86 to provide more justification for your study (specifically, you should expand upon the knowledge gap being filled).*

**Comment on language and grammar issues**

*The English language should be improved to ensure that an international audience can clearly understand your text. Some examples where the language could be improved include lines 23, 77, 121, 128 – the current phrasing makes comprehension difficult.*

**Organize by importance of the issues, and number your points**

1. Your most important issue
2. The next most important item
3. ...
4. The least important points

**Please provide constructive criticism, and avoid personal opinions**

*I thank you for providing the raw data, however your supplemental files need more descriptive metadata identifiers to be useful to future readers. Although your results are compelling, the data analysis should be improved in the following ways: AA, BB, CC*

**Comment on strengths (as well as weaknesses) of the manuscript**

*I commend the authors for their extensive data set, compiled over many years of detailed fieldwork. In addition, the manuscript is clearly written in professional, unambiguous language. If there is a weakness, it is in the statistical analysis (as I have noted above) which should be improved upon before Acceptance.*

# Rehabilitation time has greater influences on soil mechanical composition and erodibility than does land type in the hilly-gully region of the Loess Plateau, China

Wenjing Chen<sup>1,2</sup>, Yang Wu<sup>2</sup>, Leilei Qiao<sup>1</sup>, Hongfei Liu<sup>2</sup>, Jiaoyang Zhang<sup>3,4</sup>, Guobin Liu<sup>1,3</sup>, Sha Xue<sup>Corresp. 1,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> State Key Laboratory of Soil Erosion and Dryland Farming on the Loess Plateau, Institute of Soil and Water Conservation, Northwest A&F University, Yangling, China

<sup>2</sup> College of Forestry, Northwest A&F University, Yangling, China

<sup>3</sup> Institute of Soil and Water Conservation, Chinese Academy of Sciences and Ministry of Water Resources, Yangling, China

<sup>4</sup> University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

Corresponding Author: Sha Xue

Email address: xuesha100@163.com

**Background.** The major landscape in the hilly-gully region of the Loess Plateau is greatly affected by vegetation rehabilitation on abandoned cropland (CL). Although many studies have shown that the rehabilitation have greatly improved soil conditions and protected them from erosion, these effectiveness were not always in consensus possibly due to the variation of vegetation or rehabilitation times. To close this gap, we conducted a long term experiment as follows.

**Methods.** In this study, we analysed four land types of vegetation rehabilitation (shrubland (SL), woodland (WL), natural grassland (NG), and orchard (OL)) with different rehabilitation times and investigated the mechanical composition and erodibility of the soil. Areas of slope CL and natural forest (NF) were selected as controls.

**Results.** The results showed that soil depth, rehabilitation time and rehabilitation land type had strong impacts on soil mechanical composition, micro-aggregation and erodibility. Following rehabilitation, NG and SL had lower fractal dimensions of particle size distribution (PD), micro-aggregation (MD), and erodibility (K) than did CL. Compared to the positive effects of rehabilitation mainly happened in the topsoil layer at other rehabilitation land type, that of WL happened in the deeper soil layer. Besides, the indispensable rehabilitation time for the significant improvement of soil condition was shorter at NG than that at SL and WL.

**Discussion.** Although rehabilitation time was more influential than was rehabilitation land type or soil depth, the differences among the rehabilitation land types showed that Natural grass is the most time-saving rehabilitation vegetation for the Loess Plateau in the conversion from slope CL, and the wood-land benefits to the rehabilitation of deeper soil layer. Based on the differences of rehabilitation effectiveness resulting from land type, we should be cautious to choose land types for the rehabilitation of soil conditions in the Loess Plateau.

Rehabilitation time has greater influences on soil mechanical composition and erodibility than does rehabilitation land type in the hilly-gully region of the Loess Plateau, China

Wenjing Chen<sup>1,2</sup>, Yang Wu<sup>2</sup>, Leilei Qiao<sup>1</sup>, Hongfei Liu<sup>2</sup>, Jiaoyang Zhang<sup>3,4</sup>,  
Guobin Liu<sup>1, 3</sup>, Sha Xue<sup>1, 3\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> State Key Laboratory of Soil Erosion and Dryland Farming on the Loess Plateau, Institute of Soil and Water Conservation, Northwest A&F University, Yangling 712100, P. R. China.

<sup>2</sup> College of Forestry, Northwest A&F University, Yangling 712100, P. R. China.

<sup>3</sup> Institute of Soil and Water Conservation, Chinese Academy of Sciences and Ministry of Water Resources, Yangling 712100, P. R. China.

<sup>4</sup> University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China.

Address correspond Institute of Soil and Water Conservation, Northwest A&F University, Yangling 712100, P. R. China. E-mail: [xuesha100@163.com](mailto:xuesha100@163.com)

Rehabilitation time has greater influences on soil mechanical composition and erodibility than does rehabilitation land type in the hilly-gully region of the Loess Plateau, China

**Background.** The major landscape in the hilly-gully region of the Loess Plateau is greatly affected by vegetation rehabilitation on abandoned cropland (CL). Although many studies have shown that the rehabilitation have greatly improved soil conditions and protected them from erosion, these effectiveness were not always in consensus possibly due to the variation of vegetation or rehabilitation times. To close this gap, we conducted a long term experiment as follows.

**Methods.** In this study, we analysed four land types of vegetation rehabilitation (shrubland (SL), woodland (WL), natural grassland (NG), and orchard (OL)) with different rehabilitation times and investigated the mechanical composition and erodibility of the soil. Areas of slope CL and natural forest (NF) were selected as controls.

**Results.** The results showed that soil depth, rehabilitation time and rehabilitation land type had strong impacts on soil mechanical composition, micro-aggregation and erodibility. Following rehabilitation, NG and SL had lower fractal dimensions of particle size distribution (PD), micro-aggregation (MD), and erodibility (K) than did CL. Compared to the positive effects of rehabilitation mainly happened in the topsoil layer at other rehabilitation land type, that of WL happened in the deeper soil layer. Besides, the indispensable rehabilitation time for the significant improvement of soil condition was shorter at NG than that at SL and WL.

**Discussion.** Although rehabilitation time was more influential than was rehabilitation land type or soil depth, the differences among the rehabilitation land types showed that Natural grass is the most time-saving rehabilitation vegetation for the Loess Plateau in the conversion from slope CL, and the wood-land benefits to the rehabilitation of deeper soil layer. Based on the differences of rehabilitation effectiveness resulting from land type, we should be cautious to choose land types for the rehabilitation of soil conditions in the Loess Plateau.

Key word: erosion; vegetation rehabilitation; fractal dimension; Loess Plateau

## Introduction

Soil erosion initiated by either natural or human factors is a serious environmental problem in many parts of the world. It not only caused the degradation of soil quality but also the destruction of ecosystem function and safety (*Chen & Peng 2000; Zheng et al., 2010; Lian et al., 2013*). Severe soil erosion is a serious challenge in the Loess Plateau of China (*Sun et al., 2016b*). To alleviate soil erosion and restore the local ecological environment, the Chinese government implemented the “Grain for Green” programme in 1999 to convert degraded cropland (CL) to forest and grassland (*Chen et al., 2007a; Zhang et al., 2011a; Song et al., 2015*). This programme has greatly decreased soil loss (*Zheng & Fen 2006; Chen et al., 2007b*).

Several studies had examined the effects of plant species changes, land preparation, rainfall intensity, anthropogenic disturbance, afforestation, and land abandonment on the mechanical composition and erodibility of the soil (*Koulouri & Giourga 2007; Keesstra et al., 2009; Xia et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2011b; Yu et al., 2017*). Soil mechanical composition and micro-

aggregate stability were shaped by complicated geophysical and environmental processes and responded to land-use changes, thereby affecting soil hydrological and mechanical functioning and soil erosion (*Wang et al., 2005; Xiao et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2016*). Many studies have reported positive impacts of vegetation rehabilitation of sloped CL on soil conditions and soil resistance to erosion (*Xu et al., 2013; Xiao et al., 2014; Fu et al., 2015; Sun et al., 2016b*). Different plant species, with differences in morphology, architecture and other biological characteristics, show variation in their effectiveness for vegetation rehabilitation (*Fu et al., 2015*). However, local precipitation of parent material, disturbance and their interaction and sampling time can influence vegetation rehabilitation and make interpretation of results challenging. Thus, long-term research on the dynamics of soil erosion is necessary to understand the effects of vegetation rehabilitation on soil physical condition while accounting for confounding factors. However, several studies have focused on the effects of different rehabilitation patterns or the dynamic changes following rehabilitation in a certain land type but have not clearly identified the impacts of the various rehabilitation land type on the soil mechanical composition and erodibility during a long-time scale.

In this study, we collected comprehensive and long-term data on historic vegetation (e.g., forest, shrubland and grassland) with different rehabilitation times (1) to elucidate the effects of rehabilitation land type, time and soil depth on soil mechanical condition and erodibility; (2) to clearly identify the key influencing factors.

## Materials and methods

### Experimental area

This study was conducted in Ansai County, Shanxi Province, China (36°31'-37°20'N, 108°52'-109°26'E; 1,012-1,731 m a.s.l.), which lies in the middle part of the Loess Plateau. This region has a typical semiarid continental climate with a mean annual temperature of 8.8°C and an annual precipitation of 549.1 mm, which mainly occurs between July and September. The landform is characterized by a deeply incised hilly-gully Loess landscape. The soil is mainly Huangmian soil (Xiao et al., 2014). This type of soil is characterized by weak cohesion (Sun et al., 2016a), which makes it highly susceptible to severe soil erosion.

Overgrazing, deforestation and other land-use patterns led to severe damage to the ecological environment and severe soil erosion by the middle of the last century. Since the late 1950s, sloping CL has been replanted with woodland (*Robinia pseudoacacia*), shrubland (*Caragana korshinskii*, *Hippophae rhamnoides*), artificial grassland (*Medicago sativa*) and naturally revegetated grassland to control soil erosion (Sun et al., 2016b).

### Sampling and data collection

Based on our investigation of the history of land use, we selected four types of vegetation rehabilitation of CL abandoned between July 10 and September 10, the season in which plant community biomass peaks, in 2011 and 2012. The four types were natural grassland (NG) (with rehabilitation times of 2a, 5a, 8a, 11a, 15a, 18a, 26a and 30a), planted shrubland (SL) (with rehabilitation times of 5a, 10a, 20a, 30a, 36a, 47a), planted woodland (WL) (with rehabilitation times of 5a, 10a, 20a, 37a and 56a), and orchard (OL) (with rehabilitation times of 5a, 10a and

20a). Sloping CL sites were selected as representative of the origin condition for the rehabilitation chronosequences of the revegetated NG, SL, WL and OL. Additionally, we considered natural forest as representative of the soil-dominated climax community in vegetation rehabilitation to assess the effectiveness of vegetation rehabilitation. These selected sites offered representativeness, typicality and consistency and had similar slope gradients, slope aspects, and topography. The properties of the experimental sites are shown in Table 1.

Three replicated plots of 20 × 20 m were established in each site of planted WL (*Robinia pseudoacacia*) ensuring that all three plots within the site had the same rehabilitation time. Three replicated plots of 10 × 10 m were established in each SL site (*Caragana microphylla*, *Hippophae rhamnoides*) ensuring that all three plots within the site had the same rehabilitation time and in each OL site ensuring that all three plots within the site had the same rehabilitation time. Three smaller replicate plots (2 × 2 m) were randomly established in each revegetated NG site (including *Artemisia sacrorum*, *A. capillaries*, *A. giraldii*, *Aneurolepidium dasystachys*, *Bothriochloa ischaemum*, *Heteropappus altaicus*, *Lespedeza bicolor*, *Stipa bungeana*, *Setaria viridis*, and other grasses) ensuring that all three plots within the site had the same rehabilitation time. The plots were separated by at least 50 m.

After removing ground litter, soil samples were collected from each plot via random sampling with a soil drilling sampler (4 cm diameter) from five soil layers (0–10, 10–20, 20–30, 30–50, and 50–100 cm). The soil samples from the same layer of the same plot were mixed to form one sample. Each sample was air-dried and passed through 2 mm screens after removing

roots, gravel, and coarse fragments. The samples were brought to the laboratory and divided into two parts. One part was naturally air-dried to measure the organic carbon and analyse soil organic carbon (SOC), total nitrogen (TN), and total phosphorus (TP) contents, particle size distributions and micro-aggregates. The other part was stored in a refrigerator at 4°C to analyse water-soluble amounts (carbon, nitrogen), microbial biomass (carbon, nitrogen), enzyme activity as well as other variables not reported in this paper.

### ***Physical and chemical analyses***

The soil bulk density (BD) of each soil layer was measured with the cutting ring method. SOC was determined using the dichromate oxidation method (Nelson & Sommers, 1982), and TN was determined using the Kjeldahl method (Bremner, 1982). For soil PSD (particle-size distribution) and micro-aggregate analysis, soil samples were analysed by a laser diffraction technique using a Longbench Mastersizer 2000 (Malvern Instruments, Malvern, England) (Xiao et al., 2014).

### ***Fractal features***

The fractal dimension of a PSD was calculated by the following formula (Tyler & Wheatcraft 1992):

$$V(r < R_i) / V_T = (R_i / R_{max})^{3-D}$$

where  $r$  is the particle size,  $R_i$  is the particle size of subinterval  $i$  in the particle size grading,  $V(r$

142  $<R_i$ ) is the mass of soil particles with diameter less than  $R_i$ ,  $V_T$  is the sum of soil particles, and  
 143  $R_{max}$  is the maximum diameter of soil particles.

# 144 **Erodibility (K)**

145 Soil erodibility was measured by the K factor in the EPIC model using SOC content and  
 146 soil PSD (*Williams et al., 1984*) and was calculated as follows:

$$147 \quad K = \{0.2 + 0.3 \exp[-0.0256 \text{SAN}(1 - 0.01 \text{SIL})]\} \\
 148 \quad \times \left( \frac{\text{SIL}}{\text{CLA} + \text{SIL}} \right)^{0.3} \times \left( 1.0 - \frac{0.25 \text{C}}{\text{C} + \exp(3.72 - 2.95 \text{C})} \right) \times \left( 1.0 - \frac{0.25 \text{C}}{\text{SNI} + \exp(-5.51 + 22.9 \text{SNI})} \right)$$

149 where SAN, SIL, and CLA are the sand (%), silt (%), and clay (%) fractions, respectively;  
 150 C is the soil organic carbon content (%); and SNI = 1-SAN/100.

# 151 **Statistical analysis**

152 Three-way ANOVA was performed to test the effects of rehabilitation land type (NG, WL,  
 153 SL, OL and MG), rehabilitation time (years since sloping CL abandonment) and soil depth (0-10  
 154 cm, 10-20 cm, 20-30 cm, 30-50 cm, and 50-100 cm) on soil mechanical composition and  
 155 erodibility. Significance was evaluated at the 0.05 level ( $P < 0.05$ ). Duncan's (D) post hoc test  
 156 was used to perform multiple comparisons when significance of the ANOVA was observed. The  
 157 differences between the natural forest and various vegetation rehabilitation at each last  
 158 restoration year were examined by student's t test. Pearson correlation analysis was used to  
 159 analyse the correlations among particle fractal dimension, micro-aggregate fractal dimension,  
 160 erodibility and soil nutrients, soil texture, and recovery time. In addition, linear regression

analysis was used to determine the relationships between each of particle fractal dimension, micro-aggregate fractal dimension, and erodibility and recovery time in each soil layer between 0 and 100 cm. All of the above statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS 17.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) and R version 3.4.4. we conducted the redundancy analysis (RDA) for the relationships between factors (rehabilitation land type, rehabilitation time, soil depth) and soil erosion properties by R version 3.4.4.

## Results

Rehabilitation time, and rehabilitation land type had significant effects on the soil PSD fractal dimension and erodibility (K), only the rehabilitation land type had significant effects on the soil micro-aggregate fractal dimension (Table 2). PSD fractal dimension, micro-aggregate fractal dimension and erodibility showed trends of decline since CL in all land types. However, PSD fractal dimension, micro-aggregate fractal dimension and erodibility varied among the land types (Figs. 2-4).

### *The rehabilitation pattern in NG*

PD and K began to show greater decreases in NG than in CL at 5<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup> years, respectively, since CL abandonment. And these trends mainly occurred in 0-20cm, gradually weaken with depth. Overall, the minimum time before significant decreases appeared in the particle fractal dimension, soil micro-aggregate fractal dimension and erodibility varied among the different rehabilitation land types; in general, the times were shorter for NG than for the other land types

(Figs. 2-4). NG did not differ from NF in MD or K (20-100cm) over rehabilitation time (Figs. 5-7). Linear regression revealed that PD decreased with the number of years since farmland conversion in the 0-50 cm (except 20-30 cm)(Figs. 2-4).

### ***The rehabilitation pattern in WL***

PD, MD and K began to show greater decrease in WL than in CL in the 10<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup> respectively since CL abandonment (Figs. 2-4). Over rehabilitation time, WL did not differ from NF in PD (30-100cm) and MD (0-100cm), K in WL did not differ from NF (0-30cm) and even was lower than that in NF (30-100cm) (Figs. 5-7). Compared to MD and K, PD in this site showed a clear decreasing trend at all soil layers (Figs. 2-4).

### ***The rehabilitation pattern in SL***

PD, MD and K began to show greater decreases in SL than in CL in the 20<sup>th</sup>, 36<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> years, respectively, since CL abandonment, and tended to have significant differences with CL since then(Figs. 2-4). The decreasing trend of PD and MD occurred in 0-100cm, but gradually weakened with increasing depth. After rehabilitation, NG were also higher than NF in PD (0-50cm), MD (0-30cm) and K (0-10cm)(Figs. 5-7), and had no difference with that of NF at the deep layer. Linear regression indicated that PD decreased with the number of years since farmland conversion in the 0-100 cm (except 30-50cm)(Figs. 2-4).

### ***The rehabilitation pattern in OL***

PD and MD showed a trend of lower levels in OL than in CL, but there is no significant

199 differences were observed between them(Figs. 2-4). However, K in this site didn't decrease after  
 200 a long-term rehabilitation. Following rehabilitation, PD, MD, and K were significantly higher in  
 201 OL than in NF at shallow soil layer(Figs. 5-7). Linear regression revealed that PD decreased with  
 202 the number of years since farmland conversion in the 0-10 cm soil layers(Figs. 2-4).

## Discussion

### *Effects of rehabilitation time on soil mechanical composition and erodibility*

In our study, rehabilitation time was a key factor in driving changes in soil mechanical condition, erodibility and properties (Table 2) (Fig. 8). The PSD fractal dimension (PD), erodibility (K) of the soil in the various rehabilitation land types showed decreasing trends following rehabilitation (Figs. 2-4). These changes were mainly due to the large amounts of soil nutrients released by residues and decomposing dead roots, and they promote plant growth and rehabilitation succession (Guo *et al.*, 2013). PD, K positively correlated with SOC. And the improvement of mechanical conditions were mainly explained by the soil nutrient levels (Table 3). Zhuang *et al.* (2008) discovered that soil organic matter, as a binding agent, favoured soil structure stabilization and infiltration and protected it from erosion. In addition, well-developed root systems played a vital role in soil mechanical functioning and actively exude substrates, such as polysaccharides, phenolic compounds, and polygalacturonic acid, that affect soil particle cohesion and aggregation (Sun *et al.*, 2016b). Furthermore, by directly binding soil particles in situ, plant roots prevented soil from being blown or washed away (Reubens *et al.*, 2007). Dense canopies and ground litter following rehabilitation protected soil aggregates from breakdown and prevent particles from being washed away by raindrop energy and runoff (Wang *et al.*, 2008).

### *Effects of rehabilitation land type on soil mechanical composition and erodibility*

Vegetation rehabilitation type was the most influential factor in driving soil mechanical

composition and erodibility (Table 2)(Fig. 8). Variation in vegetation recovery patterns and plant traits led to variation in the production and release of soil organic matter, which affect soil crusting, splash, aggregate size and stability. For example, high levels soil organic matter reduced soil vulnerability to detachment by surface flow, rain splash and other erosion-inducing phenomena (Xiao *et al.*, 2014; Fu *et al.*, 2015). Litters with different chemical composition among different plant species would impact decomposition rates and the release of soil organic matter (Ayres *et al.*, 2006). Thus NG site dominated with high quality litter showed faster circulating rates than shrub and tree sites dominated with relative low quality litter. This phenomenon may explain why the recovery time needed to reach significant improvements of soil mechanical conditions and soil erosion was shorter for NG than for WL and SL. Our results are in accordance with the study of Yu *et al.* (2015), which showed that high concentrations of soil organic matter greatly affected the fractal dimensions of PSD and generally facilitated the improvement of soil structure. In addition, vegetation alleviates erosion of soil by its canopy effectively reducing water-induced soil erosion (Kutilek 1995; Mohammad & Adam 2010; Wei *et al.*, 2010). However, these effectiveness were different from various land type. In NG, the lower vegetation layer was more effective in reducing the kinetic energy of rainfall striking the soil surface than the tall vegetation in SL and WL. Owing to the lack of roots at deep soil layer, the NG only showed positive effect at the shallow soil layer(0-10cm). However, due to the stronger stretching ability of the trees roots, WL site also showed the potential of alleviate soil erosion at deep layer. The soil loss in OL was continued over a long time owing to human disturbances (such as production management and tillage practices) and the absence of surface cover

protection, which leads to the breakdown of shallow soil aggregates and the washing away of soil particles by raindrop energy and runoff (*Wang et al., 2008*).

### ***Effects of soil depth on soil fractal dimension and erodibility***

In the four types of vegetation rehabilitation, soil depth had large influences on soil mechanical composition and erodibility (Table 2)(Figs. 8) being consistent with previous studies (*Xiao et al., 2014*). In our study, the positive effects of vegetation recovery mainly occurred in the topsoil with the higher reduction rates of PD, MD and K in the topsoil than in the subsoil (Figs. 2-4). This pattern was resulting from the variation in plant root distribution density decreasing along soil depth (*Reubens et al., 2007*); thus, the deeper soil layers were, the weaker the improvements of soil conditions were (*Sun et al., 2014*). In addition, soil nutrients accumulated near the soil surface also due to the decomposition of vegetation litter and biogeochemical cycling (*Wang et al., 2014*).

### **Conclusion**

Our study suggested that vegetation rehabilitation time, type and soil depth significantly affects soil mechanical composition and erosion. Following the conversion of sloping CL to NG, SL or WL, the soil structure gradually recovered, and the resistance of the soil against erosive forces gradually increased, primarily within the topsoil. For the conversion of sloping CL, planting grass represents a more efficient rehabilitation practice than does the planting of other vegetation types. Meanwhile, the WL was the best type to improve soil mechanical condition and

the erodibility of deep soil layer. Based on the differences of rehabilitation effectiveness among the rehabilitation land type, it is important to carefully select land types for the rehabilitation of soil conditions in the Loess Plateau. Our study, conducted at the regional scale, revealed the effects of vegetation rehabilitation on soil erosion in the Loess Plateau, China. This study contributes to our understanding of the mechanisms through which rehabilitation improves soil quality and provides a suggestion for ecosystem management in arid and semi-arid regions.

## Acknowledgements

We thank the anonymous referees and editors of the journal who provided valuable comments and suggestions on our manuscript. This research was funded by the National Key Research and Development Program of China (2016YFC0501707).

## References

- Ayres E, Dromph KM, Bardgett RD. 2006.** Do plant species encourage soil biota that specialise in the rapid decomposition of their litter? *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* **38**: 183-186.
- Bremner J M, Mulvaney C S. 1982.** Nitrogen-total. Agronomy monography 9. In: Page A L, Miller R H, Keeney D R. *Methods of Soil Analysis, Part 2, Chemical and Microbial Properties*, Madison: Agronomy Society of America, 595–624.
- Chen F, Peng BZ. 2000.** The effect of land use changes on soil conditions in arid region. *Chinese Geographical Science* **10**:226-230.
- Chen L, Fu GB, Huang Z, Huang Y, Gui L. 2007a.** Effect of land use conversion on soil

organic carbon sequestration in the loess hilly area, loess plateau of China. *Ecological Research* **22**:641-648 DOI 10.1007/s11284-006-0065-1

**Chen L, Wei W, Fu B, Lu Y. 2007b.** Soil and Water Conservation on the Loess Plateau in China: Review and Perspective. *Progress in Physical Geography* **31**:3547-3554 DOI 10.1177/0309133307081290

**Fu BJ, Wang YF, Lu YH, He CS, Chen LD, Song CJ. 2015.** The effects of land-use combinations on soil erosion: a case study in the Loess Plateau of China. *Progress in Physical Geography* **33**:793-804 DOI 10.1177/0309133309350264

**Gao L, Bowker MA, Xu M, Sun H, Tuo D, Zhao Y. 2017.** Biological soil crusts decrease erodibility by modifying inherent soil properties on the Loess Plateau, China. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* **105**:49-58 DOI 10.1016/j.soilbio.2016.11.009

**Guo C, Dannenmann M, Gasche R, Zeller B, Papen H, Polle A, Rennenberg H, Simon J. 2013.** Preferential use of root litter compared to leaf litter by beech seedlings and soil microorganisms. *Plant & Soil* **368**:519-534 DOI 10.1007/s11104-012-1521-z

**Hu F, Liu J, Xu C, Wang Z, Liu G, Li H, Zhao S. 2018.** Soil internal forces initiate aggregate breakdown and splash erosion. *Geoderma* **320**:43-51 DOI 10.1016/j.geoderma.2018.01.019

**Keesstra SD, Dam OV, Verstraeten G, Huissteden JV. 2009.** Changing sediment dynamics due to natural reforestation in the Dragonja catchment, SW Slovenia. *Catena* **78**:60-71 DOI 10.1016/j.catena.2009.02.021

- 301 **Koulouri, M, Giourga, C. 2007.** Land abandonment and slope gradient as key factors of soil  
302 erosion in Mediterranean terraced lands. *Catena* **69**:274-281 DOI  
303 10.1016/j.catena.2006.07.001
  
- 304 **Lian, J, Zhao XY, Zuo XA, Wang SK, Wang XY, Luo YQ. 2013.** Land cover changes and the  
305 effects of cultivation on soil properties in Shelihu wetland, Horqin Sandy Land, Northern  
306 China. *Journal of Arid Land* **5**:71-79 DOI 10.1007/s40333-013-0143-5
  
- 307 **Mohammad AG, Adam MA. 2010.** The impact of vegetative cover type on runoff and soil  
308 erosion under different land uses. *Catena* **81**:97-103 DOI: 10.1016/j.catena.2010.01.008
  
- 309 **Nelson D W, Sommers L E. 1982.** Total carbon, organic carbon, and organic matter. Agronomy  
310 nonograph 9. In: Page A L, Miller RH, Keeney DR. Methods of Soil Analysis, Part 2,  
311 Chemical and Microbial Properties. Madison: Agronomy Society of America, 539–552
  
- 312 **Parysow P, Wang G, Gertner G, Anderson AB. 2003.** Spatial uncertainty analysis for  
313 mapping soil erodibility based on joint sequential simulation. *Catena* **53**:65-78 DOI  
314 10.1016/S0341-8162(02)00198-4
  
- 315 **Reubens B, Poesen J, Danjon F, Geudens G, Muys B. 2007.** The role of fine and coarse roots  
316 in shallow slope stability and soil erosion control with a focus on root system architecture: a  
317 review. *Trees* **21**:385-402 DOI 10.1007/s00468-007-0132-4
  
- 318 **Song Z, Zhang C, Liu G, Dong Q, Xue S. 2015.** Fractal Feature of Particle-Size Distribution in  
319 the Rhizospheres and Bulk Soils during Natural Recovery on the Loess Plateau, China. *Plos*

- 320 *One* **10**:e0138057 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0140305
  
- 321 **Sun C, Liu G, Xue S. 2016a.** Land-Use Conversion Changes the Multifractal Features of  
322 Particle-Size Distribution on the Loess Plateau of China. *International Journal of*  
323 *Environmental Research & Public Health* **13** DOI 10.3390/ijerph13080785
  
- 324 **Sun C, Liu G, Xue S. 2016b.** Natural succession of grassland on the Loess Plateau of China  
325 affects multifractal characteristics of soil particle-size distribution and soil nutrients.  
326 *Ecological Research* **31**:1-12 DOI 10.1007/s11284-016-1399-y
  
- 327 **Sun W, Shao Q, Liu J, Zhai J. 2014.** Assessing the effects of land use and topography on soil  
328 erosion on the Loess Plateau in China. *Catena* **121**:151-163 DOI  
329 10.1016/j.catena.2014.05.009
  
- 330 **Tyler SW, Wheatcraft SW, 1992.** Fractal Scaling of Soil Particle-Size Distributions: Analysis  
331 and Limitations. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* **56**:362-369 DOI  
332 10.2136/sssaj1992.03615995005600020005x
  
- 333 **Wang B, Liu GB, Xue S, Zhu B. 2011.** Changes in soil physico-chemical and microbiological  
334 properties during natural succession on abandoned farmland in the Loess Plateau.  
335 *Environmental Earth Sciences* **62**:915-925 DOI 10.1007/s12665-010-0577-4
  
- 336 **Wang D, Fu B, Zhao W, Hu H, Wang Y. 2008.** Multifractal characteristics of soil particle size  
337 distribution under different land-use types on the Loess Plateau, China. *Catena* **72**:29-36  
338 DOI 10.1016/j.catena.2007.03.019

- 339 **Wang G, Gertner G, Liu X, Anderson A. 2001.** Uncertainty assessment of soil erodibility
- 340 factor for revised universal soil loss equation. *Catena* **46**:1-14 DOI 10.1016/S0341-
- 341 8162(01)00158-8
- 342 **Wang HM, Wang WJ, Chen H, Zhang Z, Mao Z, Zu YG. 2014.** Temporal changes of soil
- 343 physic-chemical properties at different soil depths during larch afforestation by multivariate
- 344 analysis of covariance. *Ecology & Evolution* **4**:1039-1048 DOI: 10.1002/ece3.947
- 345 **Wang J G, Yang W, Yu B, Li ZX, Cai CF, Ma RM. 2016.** Estimating the influence of related
- 346 soil properties on macro- and micro-aggregate stability in ultisols of south-central China.
- 347 *Catena* **137**:545-553 DOI 10.1016/j.catena.2015.11.001
- 348 **Wang XD, Liu SZ, Liu GC. 2005.** Fractal Characteristics of Soil under Different Land-Use
- 349 Patterns in the Arid and Semi-Arid Region of the Western Tibet Plateau, China. **Wuhan**
- 350 **University Journal of Natural Sciences** **10**:785-790
- 351 **Wei W, Chen L, Fu B, Chen J. 2010.** Water erosion response to rainfall and land use in
- 352 different drought-level years in a loess hilly area of China. *Catena* **81**:24-31 DOI
- 353 10.1016/j.catena.2010.01.002
- 354 **Williams JR, Jones CA, Dyke PT, 1984.** A modeling approach to determining the relationship
- 355 between erosion and soil productivity. *Transactions of the ASAE* **27**:129-144.
- 356 **Xia L, Zhang GC, Heathman GC, Wang YQ, Huang CH. 2009.** Fractal features of soil
- 357 particle-size distribution as affected by plant communities in the forested region of

- 358 Mountain Yimeng, China. *Geoderma* **154**:123-130 DOI 10.1016/j.geoderma.2009.10.005
- 359 **Xiao L, Xue S, Liu GB, Zhang C. 2014.** Fractal features of soil profiles under different land use  
360 patterns on the Loess Plateau, China. *Journal of Arid Land* **6**:550-560 DOI  
361 10.1007/s40333-014-0023-7
- 362 **Xu G, Li Z, Li P. 2013.** Fractal features of soil particle-size distribution and total soil nitrogen  
363 distribution in a typical watershed in the source area of the middle Dan River, China.  
364 *Catena* **101**:17-23 DOI 10.1016/j.catena.2012.09.013
- 365 **Yu J, Lv X, Bin M, Wu H, Du S, Zhou M, Yang Y, Han G. 2015.** Fractal features of soil  
366 particle size distribution in newly formed wetlands in the Yellow River Delta. *Scientific*  
367 *Reports* **5**:10540 DOI 10.1038/srep10540
- 368 **Zhang C, Xue S, Liu GB, Song, ZL. 2011a.** A comparison of soil qualities of different  
369 revegetation types in the Loess Plateau, China. *Plant & Soil* **347**:163-178 DOI  
370 10.1007/s11104-011-0836-5
- 371 **Zhang GH, Liu GB, Wang GL, Wang, YX. 2011b.** Effects of Vegetation Cover and Rainfall  
372 Intensity on Sediment-Bound Nutrient Loss, Size Composition and Volume Fractal  
373 Dimension of Sediment Particles. *Pedosphere* **21**:676-684 DOI 10.1016/S1002-  
374 0160(11)60170-7
- 375 **Su ZA, Zhang JH, Nie XJ. 2010.** Effect of Soil Erosion on Soil Properties and Crop Yields on  
376 Slopes in the Sichuan Basin, China. *Pedosphere* **20**:736-746 DOI 10.1016/S1002-

377 0160(10)60064-1

378 **Zheng FL. 2006.** Effect of Vegetation Changes on Soil Erosion on the Loess Plateau.

379 *Pedosphere* **16**:420-427 DOI 10.1016/S1002-0160(06)60071-4

380 **Zhu B, Li Z, Li P, Liu G, Xue S. 2010.** Soil erodibility, microbial biomass, and physical–

381 chemical property changes during long-term natural vegetation rehabilitation: a case study

382 in the Loess Plateau, China. *Ecological Research* **25**:531-541.

383 **Zhuang J, McCarthy JF, Perfect E, Mayer LM, Jastrow JD. 2008.** Soil Water Hysteresis in


384 Water-Stable Microaggregates as Affected by Organic Matter. *Soil Science Society of*

385 *America Journal* **72**:212-220 DOI 10.2136/sssaj2007.0001

# Figure 1

Fig. 1. Location of the Loess Plateau China


**Fig. 1.** Location of the Loess Plateau China



## Figure 2 (on next page)

Fig. 2. Particle fractal dimension change with time since cropland abandonment in various vegetation restoration patterns.





Note: a: natural grassland, b: woodland, c: shrub land, d: orchard. 0: crop land. We set the CL as the initial stage of the rehabilitation process. Different lower-case letters above the bars mean significant differences among different ages within the same rehabilitation patterns ( $P < 0.05$ ).



# **Figure 3**(on next page)

Fig. 3. Micro-aggregate fractal dimension change with time since cropland abandonment in various vegetation rehabilitation patterns.


Note: a: natural grassland, b: woodland, c: shrub land, d: orchard. 0: crop land. We set the CL as the initial stage of the rehabilitation process. Different lower-case letters above the bars mean significant differences among different ages within the same rehabilitation patterns ( $P < 0.05$ ).



# **Figure 4**(on next page)

Fig. 4. Erodibility change with time since cropland abandonment in various vegetation rehabilitation patterns.


Note: a: natural grassland, b: woodland, c: shrub land, d: orchard. 0: crop land. We set the CL as the initial stage of the rehabilitation process. Different lower-case letters above the bars mean significant differences among different ages within the same rehabilitation patterns ( $P < 0.05$ ).



## Figure 5 (on next page)

The differences of particle fractal dimension between the natural forest and various vegetation restoration patterns at each last restoration year.

Note: A: 0-10cm, B: 10-20cm , C: 20-30cm , D: 30-50cm ,E: 50-100cm. \* means significant differences between the natural forest and various vegetation restoration patterns at each last restoration year ( $P < 0.05$ ).




## Figure 6 (on next page)

The differences of micro-aggregate fractal dimension between the natural forest and various vegetation restoration patterns at each last restoration year.

Note: A: 0-10cm, B: 10-20cm , C: 20-30cm , D: 30-50cm ,E: 50-100cm. \* means significant differences between the natural forest and various vegetation restoration patterns at each last restoration year ( $P < 0.05$ ).


Micro-aggregate fractal dimension



# Figure 7 (on next page)

The differences of erodibility between the natural forest and various vegetation restoration patterns at each last restoration year.


Note: A: 0-10cm, B: 10-20cm , C: 20-30cm , D: 30-50cm ,E: 50-100cm. \* means significant differences between the natural forest and various vegetation restoration patterns at each last restoration year ( $P < 0.05$ ).



# **Figure 8**(on next page)

Biplot of the first two RDA axes between the vegetation Rehabilitation patterns, soil depth, restoration time and fractal dimension, erodibility( K factor), TC, TOC, TN, each classes particles and micro-aggregate.

Biplot of the first two RDA axes between the vegetation Rehabilitation patterns, soil depth, restoration time and fractal dimension, erodibility( K factor), TC, TOC, TN, each classes particles and micro-aggregate.



**Table 1** (on next page)

Table 1 Basic information of sample plots

Table 1 Basic information of sample plots

| Restoration pattern          | Site code | Rehabilitation years (a) | Altitude (m) | Slop(°) | Vegetation coverage (%) | <i>Understory vegetation types</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|--------------|---------|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| CL<br><br><br><br><br><br>NG | AS0       | 0                        | 1270-1290    | 17-24   | 32                      | <i>Setaria italica</i> , <i>Glycine max</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|                              | AS1       | 2                        | 1101-1276    | 13-27   | 12.1-19.8               | <i>Geranium wilfordii</i> Maxim , <i>Artemisia capillaris</i> ,<br><i>Parthenocissus tricuspidata</i> , <i>Setaria viridis</i>                                                                                                               |
|                              | AS2       | 5                        | 1185-1262    | 17-19   | 30.7-57.3               | <i>Artemisia leucophylla</i> , <i>Artemisia capillaris</i> , <i>Poa sphondylodes</i> , <i>Sonchus oleraceus</i> L , <i>Lespedeza bicolor</i> Turcz , <i>Heteropappus altaicus</i>                                                            |
|                              | AS3       | 8                        | 1235-1276    | 12-40   | 18-60.4                 | <i>Lespedeza bicolor</i> Turcz , <i>Artemisia capillaris</i> ,<br><i>Leymus secalinus</i> , <i>Potentilla bifurca</i> ,<br><i>Bothriochloa ischaemum</i> , <i>Stipa bungeana</i> ,<br><i>Dendranthema indicum</i>                            |
|                              | AS4       | 11                       | 1198-1292    | 23-37   | 24-76.3                 | <i>Artemisia leucophylla</i> , <i>Tripolium vulgare</i> ,<br><i>Lespedeza bicolor</i> Turcz , <i>Stipa bungeana</i> ,<br><i>Cleistogenes hancei</i> , <i>Artemisia capillaris</i> ,<br><i>Heteropappus altaicus</i> , <i>Setaria viridis</i> |
|                              | AS5       | 15                       | 1291-1306    | 14-19   | 39.8-76                 | <i>Tripolium vulgare</i> , <i>Lespedeza bicolor</i> Turcz , <i>Stipa bungeana</i> , <i>Cleistogenes hancei</i> , <i>Stipa grandis</i> ,<br><i>Heteropappus altaicus</i> , <i>Roegneria kamoji</i>                                            |
|                              | AS6       | 18                       | 1179-1189    | 22-30   | 16-49                   | <i>Artemisia leucophylla</i> , <i>Tripolium vulgare</i> ,<br><i>Lespedeza bicolor</i> Turcz , <i>Stipa bungeana</i> ,                                                                                                                        |

|    |      |    |           |       |           |                                                                                                                                                                           |
|----|------|----|-----------|-------|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| SL |      |    |           |       |           | <i>Cleistogenes hancei</i> , <i>Stipa grandis</i>                                                                                                                         |
|    | AS7  | 26 | 1144-1161 | 22-28 | 21.8-68.9 | <i>Artemisia leucophylla</i> , <i>Tripolium vulgare</i> ,<br><i>Lespedeza bicolor</i> Turcz, <i>Stipa bungeana</i> ,<br><i>Cleistogenes hancei</i>                        |
|    | AS8  | 30 | 1149-1293 | 14-29 | 33-79.7   | <i>Artemisia leucophylla</i> , <i>Tripolium vulgare</i> ,<br><i>Lespedeza bicolor</i> Turcz, <i>Stipa bungeana</i> ,<br><i>Cleistogenes hancei</i> , <i>Stipa grandis</i> |
|    | AS9  | 5  | 1281-1290 | 12-21 | 20-38     | <i>Artemisia argyi</i> , <i>Artemisia giraldii</i> , <i>Lespedeza bicolor</i>                                                                                             |
|    | AS10 | 10 | 1139-1161 | 29-32 | 53-78.4   | <i>Bothriochloa ischaemum</i> , <i>Stipa bungeana</i> ,<br><i>Artemisia giraldii</i>                                                                                      |
|    | AS11 | 10 | 1264-1281 | 14-27 | 36-57     | <i>Artemisia argyi</i>                                                                                                                                                    |
|    | AS12 | 20 | 1185      | 21    | 52        | <i>Melica scabrosa</i>                                                                                                                                                    |
|    | AS13 | 20 | 1203-1211 | 21-22 | 28-53     | <i>Stipa bungeana</i> , <i>Artemisia argyi</i> , <i>Artemisia giraldii</i> <i>Lespedeza bicolor</i>                                                                       |
|    | AS14 | 30 | 1128-1139 | 14-25 | 21-46.3   | <i>Artemisia argyi</i>                                                                                                                                                    |
|    | AS15 | 36 | 1211-1253 | 20    | 46-65     | <i>Stipa bungeana</i> , <i>Setaria viridis</i> , <i>Artemisia argyi</i> , <i>Setaria viridis</i> , <i>Artemisia giraldii</i>                                              |
|    | AS16 | 47 | 1181-1241 | 18-24 | 49.3-89.6 | <i>Stipa bungeana</i> , <i>Artemisia argyi</i> , <i>Artemisia</i>                                                                                                         |

|           |      |     |           |         |       |                                                                                 |
|-----------|------|-----|-----------|---------|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|           |      |     |           |         |       | <i>giraldii pamp.</i>                                                           |
|           | AS17 | 5   | 1259-1288 | 22-34   | 36-56 | <i>Stipa bungeana</i> , <i>Artemisia argyi</i> , <i>Lespedeza bicolor</i>       |
|           | AS18 | 10  | 1161-1227 | 27.5-33 | 38-53 | <i>Artemisia argyi</i> , <i>Setaria viridis</i> , <i>Leymus secalinus</i>       |
| <b>WL</b> | AS19 | 20  | 1236-1259 | 17-26   | 32-42 | <i>Artemisia argyi</i> , <i>Setaria viridis</i>                                 |
|           | AS20 | 37  | 1209-1259 | 30-33   | 53-65 | <i>Artemisia gmelinii</i> , <i>Artemisia argyi</i> , <i>Stipa bungeana</i>      |
|           | AS21 | 56  | 1170-1175 | 21-22   | 49-90 | <i>Stipa bungeana</i> , <i>Artemisia argyi</i>                                  |
|           | AS22 | 5   | 1207-1226 | 0       |       |                                                                                 |
| <b>OL</b> | AS23 | 10  | 1220-1254 | 0       |       |                                                                                 |
|           | AS24 | 20  | 1206-1222 | 0       |       |                                                                                 |
|           | AS25 | 100 | 1332-1337 | 14-29   | 39-52 | <i>Vittaria flexuosa</i> , <i>Syzygium aromaticum</i>                           |
| <b>NF</b> | AS26 | 100 | 1235-1283 | 23-38   | 35-70 | <i>Artemisia gmelinii</i> , <i>Lespedeza bicolor</i> , <i>Vittaria flexuosa</i> |
|           | AS27 | 100 | 1552-1570 | 28-45   | 10-28 | <i>Rosa xanthina</i> , <i>Vittaria flexuosa</i>                                 |



## Table 2 (on next page)

Table 2 Tests of the soil particle fractal dimension, micro-aggregate fractal dimension, erodibility linkage with time (years since cropland abandonment), Rehabilitation pattern and soil depth

\*\* Indicates a significant difference at the 0.01 level ( $P < 0.01$ ). \*\*\* Indicates a significant difference at the 0.001 level ( $P < 0.001$ ).

| Source                                              | Particles fractal dimension (PD) |          | Micro-aggregate fractal dimension (MD) |         | Erodibility (K) |         |
|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|
|                                                     | F                                | P        | F                                      | P       | F               | P       |
| Rehabilitation types                                | 34.111                           | 0.000*** | 4.901                                  | 0.002** | 10.007          | 0.000** |
| Rehabilitation time                                 | 15.283                           | 0.000*** | 0.943                                  | 0.508   | 5.491           | 0.000** |
| Soil depth                                          | 3.282                            | 0.012*   | 0.108                                  | 0.98    | 25.056          | 0.000** |
| Rehabilitation time×Rehabilitation types            | 4.16                             | 0.001*** | 0.628                                  | 0.678   | 2.127           | 0.06    |
| Soil depth×Rehabilitation types                     | 0.143                            | 1        | 0.568                                  | 0.867   | 0.393           | 0.96    |
| Soil depth×Rehabilitation time                      | 0.278                            | 1        | 0.321                                  | 1       | 0.379           |         |
| Rehabilitation time×Soil depth×Rehabilitation types | 0.568                            | 0.933    | 0.824                                  | 0.685   | 0.349           | 0.99    |

1

2

3



# **Table 3**(on next page)

Table 3 Relationships between particle fractal dimension, micro-aggregate fractal dimension, erodibility and soil nutrients and soil bulk density.

\*Correlation is significant at the  $P \leq 0.05$  level (2-tailed); \*\*Correlation is significant at the  $P \leq 0.01$  level (2-tailed) \*\*\*

|                                                     | BD      | TOC      | TN       |
|-----------------------------------------------------|---------|----------|----------|
| particle fractal dimension fractal dimension        | 0.185** | -0.380** | -0.146** |
| micro-aggregate fractal dimension fractal dimension | 0.018   | -0.024   | 0.048    |
| erodibility                                         | 0.410** | -0.658** | -0.399** |