

1 **Seasonal changes of the soil hydrological and erosive response in contrasted Mediterranean eco-**
2 **geomorphological conditions at patch scale**

3 M. A. Gabarrón-Galeote¹, J. F. Martínez-Murillo², M. A. Quesada³ and J. D. Ruiz-Sinoga².

4 ¹George Lemaître Centre for Earth and Climate Research, Earth & Life Institute, Université catholique de
5 Louvain, Place Louis Pasteur 3, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.

6 ²Department of Geography, University of Málaga, Campus Teatinos, 29071 Málaga, Spain.

7 ³Department of Plant Biology, University of Málaga, Campus Teatinos, 29071 Málaga, Spain

8
9 Mediterranean areas are characterized by a strong spatial variability that makes highly complex the soil
10 hydrological response. Moreover, Mediterranean climate has a marked seasonal variability that provokes
11 dramatic changes on the soil properties determining the hydrological behaviour, such as soil water
12 content, crust formation or soil water repellency (SWR). Thus, soil hydrological and erosive response in
13 Mediterranean areas can be highly time- as well space-dependant. The main goal of this study was to
14 characterize the relations between SWR, aspect and vegetation, determining the soil hydrological and
15 erosive response throughout the rainy period in different microenvironments of opposite hillslopes.

16 This study was undertaken in a small catchment located in the South of Spain. Erosion plots were
17 installed in the north- and the south-facing hillslope, in areas with different vegetal cover, and runoff and
18 sediments were collected. Moreover, precipitation parameters were recorded and SWR measurements
19 were performed.

20 SWR proved to have a significant effect on the soil hydrological response, but this influence was
21 modulated by seasonal changes and by the discontinuities on the repellent layer. In general, the influence
22 of SWR was restricted to the first rains after the summer and was greater on the north-facing hillslope due
23 to the more continuous vegetation cover. The more important precipitation parameter influencing runoff
24 generated was maximum rainfall intensity in ten minutes (I_{max}). The relation between I_{max} and overland
25 flow showed a contrasting seasonal behaviour in the north-facing hillslope and, on the contrary, remained
26 homogeneous throughout the year in the south-facing hillslope.

Comentario [1]: I suggest this title: Seasonal changes in soil water repellency depending on aspect and vegetation type in different Mediterranean microenvironments

Comentario [2]: I think the abstract does not show a complete scheme, you must include some comments about results and conclusions

27 1 Introduction

28

29 Traditionally it has been considered that soils infiltrate more when they are dry due to the high matric
30 suction and the action of capillarity forces (Beven, 2001). However, this fact has been revoked under
31 certain circumstances by numerous studies in recent years, arguing that repellent soils can have infiltration
32 rates in several orders of magnitude lower than they are supposed to have in hydrophilic conditions (De
33 Bano, 1971; Doerr et al., 2000). Soil water repellency (SWR) has received an increasing attention from
34 the scientific community in the last decades and has been reported in several climates and soil types
35 (Doerr et al., 2000). This property is favoured by low soil moisture content, although soil drying by itself
36 is not enough to trigger soil water repellency and the addition of fresh hydrophobic compounds is also
37 needed (Doerr and Thomas, 2000).

Comentario [3]: Remove

38 The necessary conditions for SWR appearance make it a widespread property under Mediterranean
39 climate. On one hand, Mediterranean climate is characterized by the coincidence in summer of the highest
40 temperatures of the year and a three-month-long drought, between June and September. This prolonged
41 dry period reduces soil moisture to the point where water repellency is triggered (Dekker et al., 2001;
42 Verheijen and Cammeraat, 2007; Martínez-Murillo and Ruiz-Sinoga, 2010; Martínez-Murillo et al.,
43 2013). On the other hand, summer drought favours the presence of deciduous and semi-deciduous plant
44 species (Orshan, 1964, 1972), that shed their leaves in summer, providing hydrophobic compounds to the
45 soil surface, since leaves of Mediterranean shrubs are often oil- or wax-rich (Moral García et al., 2005).
46 Moreover, in Mediterranean areas there is also a high recurrence of forest fires (Trabaud, 1981) which are
47 frequently related to SWR appearance.

Comentario [4]: Remove this sentence

48 One of the main effects of SWR is enhancing overland flow and soil erosion due to the low infiltration
49 capacity of repellent soils (Doerr et al., 2000). In addition, SWR can enhance soil erosion since it reduces
50 the aggregation capacity of soil particles making them easily detachable (Shakesby et al., 2000). However,
51 there are several problems that make difficult to establish links between SWR and soil erosion (Shakesby
52 et al., 2000): i) the effect of SWR on soil erosion is hard to isolate from other factors that also change
53 seasonally, such as soil crust formation and litter production; ii) the influence of SWR is determined by
54 the scale, changing from plot to catchment measurements due to spaces discontinuities where generated
55 runoff can infiltrate; iii) SWR has a seasonal oddity, being more frequent after the drought season, but it
56 can also appear during dry spells in the middle of the wet season (Crockford et al., 1991). Moreover, in
57 Mediterranean areas, there is a high variability of vegetal cover and soil surface components in short
58 spaces. One of the main factors affecting vegetation is the aspect (Kutiel, 1992), that influences not only
59 the total cover but also the distribution, structure, density and composition of vegetal communities
60 (Klemmedson and Wienhold, 1992; Olivero and Hix, 1998; Kutiel and Lavee, 1999).

Comentario [5]: Rewrite this paragraph please or explain better

61 Moreover, apart from promoting overland flow triggering SWR, vegetation can enhance infiltration
62 reducing crusting in the soil surface and supplying rests of plants (stems, leaves, and roots) that enrich the
63 soil, and support the microorganisms that transform these remains into soil organic compounds
64 (Puigdefábregas, 2005), favoring the formation of stable aggregates (Imeson and Vis, 1982; Imeson and
65 Verstraten, 1989). Thus, vegetation can influence the soil hydrological response in opposing ways: mostly
66 favoring water infiltration, but also triggering runoff processes when SWR is developed.

Comentario [6]: One of this problem is

Comentario [7]: delete

Comentario [8]: delete

Comentario [9]: delete

Comentario [10]: delete

67 This study is developed in a small catchment under Mediterranean climate conditions in the South of
68 Spain. The main goal is to shed light in the relations between SWR, aspect and vegetation, determining
69 the soil hydrological and erosive response throughout the rainy period in different microenvironments.
70 According to this aim, the objectives are: i) to determine the influence of aspect and vegetal cover on the

Comentario [11]: I think that you can add new references to this sentence. For example:
EFFECTIVENESS OF HYDROMULCHING TO REDUCE RUNOFF AND EROSION IN A RECENTLY BURNT PINE PLANTATION IN CENTRAL PORTUGAL
LAND DEGRADATION & DEVELOPMENT
Sérgio Alegre Prats, Maruxa Cortizo Malvar, Diana Catarina Simões Vieira, Lee MacDonald and Jan Jacob Keizer 2013, DOI: 10.1002/ldr.2236

Comentario [12]: Delete the space

Comentario [13]: Substitute for 'establish relationships between aspect and vegetal cover'

71 hydrological and erosive response of soils; ii) to characterise the seasonality of SWR, runoff and soil loss;
72 iii) to establish the relations between precipitation and soil erosion parameters; and iv) to assess the
73 influence of SWR on the soil hydrological and erosive response

Comentario [14]: I think that is not an objective of this research.

74 2 Field site

Comentario [15]: Study area

77 The experimental area was a small watershed located in southern Spain (36°50' N, 4°50' W), (Fig. 1). In
78 general, the area is characterized by a dry Mediterranean climate (mean annual precipitation 576.1 mm
79 y⁻¹; mean annual temperature 15.7°C); the dominance of water erosion processes on steep (> 12.5°)
80 hillslopes with a substratum of metamorphic rocks (phyllites); and land uses including rangelands,
81 evergreen forests, abandoned land, and olive and almond orchards. The De Martonne index (19.7) for the
82 area indicates that the field site is located between semiarid and subhumid climatic conditions. Areas with
83 extensive vegetation cover are characterized by an association of Cambisol and eutric Regosol soils,
84 whereas in the most degraded areas the soils are episkeletic Cambisols associated with haplic epileptic-
85 episkeletic Regosols and eutric Leptosols. Two hillslopes, one north-facing and the other south-facing,
86 were selected for the study.

Comentario [16]: Reference this data

87 The north-facing hillslope is characterized by an open woodland of cork oak with typical degraded
88 Mediterranean scrub (*Smilax mauritanicae* and *Quercus rotundifoliae quercetosa suberis*). The
89 vegetation cover is rather continuous, with a mean tree cover of 40–50% and shrub cover > 75%. *Cistus*
90 spp. (*C. monspeliensis* and *C. albidus*) are the dominant shrub species on the hillslope and in adjacent
91 natural areas. The hillslope is steep (15°), with a convex–rectilinear–concave topographic profile, and an
92 aspect of N0°. The soil surface not covered by shrubs is characterized by the presence of abundant litter
93 from *Cistus* spp. and *Quercus suber*. Soil depths range from 30 to 50 cm, and the rock fragment cover is
94 < 10%. The soil texture is sandy loam in areas of bare soil, and sandy–clayey loam under shrubs. The
95 organic matter content ranges from 4% in bare soil areas to 5.2% under shrubs. At hillslope spatial scale,
96 the major soil surface components are patches of *Cistus* spp. (mean size >2 m²) and bare soil; in both
97 cases the soil is covered by a thick layer (typically 2–5 cm) of litter.

Comentario [17]: Remove

Comentario [18]: Cistus

Comentario [19]: Cistus

Comentario [20]: N (0°)

98 The south-facing hillslope was previously cultivated with cereals, but abandoned in the mid-1950s. It is
99 very steep (22.4°), with a convex–rectilinear topographic profile and an aspect of N180°. It has been
100 reforest and is now covered by a patchy vegetation mosaic of bare soil and Mediterranean plant species
101 (60% vegetation cover, which is similar to that of natural hillslopes in the surrounding area; mean patch
102 size <2 m²). *Cistus* spp. are the most common plants growing on the hillslope. In winter, the bare soil area
103 is covered by annual plants, the dead structures of which accumulate on the soil surface during summer.
104 The soils are affected by water erosion and, as a result, they are characterized by a rock fragment cover of
105 20–70%. The soils depth is shallow (20–30 cm), they have a high gravel content (54.0% in association
106 with shrubs and 67% in bare soil areas) and pH of 6.9. The texture is sandy loam in both bare soil and
107 under-shrub areas. The organic matter content ranges from 1.5% in bare soil areas to 3.5% under shrubs.
108 The principal soil surface components are *Cistus* spp. patches and bare soil areas. However, the soil
109 surface has less litter cover than the north facing hillslope. The soil surface beneath shrubs typically
110 comprises annual plants and a 1–2 cm cover of litter.

Comentario [21]: species

Comentario [22]: Is an average?

Comentario [23]: remove

111
112 Figure 1. Location of the experimental area and general view of both north and south-facing hillslopes.

113

114 3 Material and methods

115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157

3.1 Precipitation

Precipitation was recorded using a meteorological station installed in the experimental area. The precision of the rain gauge was 0.3 mm. Precipitation was recorded every 10 minutes and the rainfall intensity was also calculated in a 10 minute basis, expressed in mm/h. Precipitation data were grouped into two different categories according to the daily mean rainfall intensity (I), the maximum precipitation intensity (in a 10 minute basis) of the day (I_{max}), and number of days between precipitation periods. The mean duration of rainy and dry spells was calculated for each period.

3.2 Soil water repellency

Water repellency was measured using the Water Drop Penetration Time (WDPT) technique (Van't Woudt, 1959), modified by the addition of eight drops of demineralized water rather than three in the sample surface. This test consists on randomly placing eight drops (0.05 ml) on the soil surface using a micropipette and measuring the time until each drop is completely infiltrated. The average of these eight measurements was taken as the respective WDPT (s) of the sample. The test was applied in the two microenvironments analyses on every hillslope (shrub-covered and shrub-bare soils). Undisturbed soil samples from the four microenvironments were collected in 100 cm³ cylinders and taken to the laboratory. The litter was removed from the surface and then it was smoothed to make it homogeneous. The drops were placed in different places of the soil surface and the time to infiltration noted. The water repellency values obtained with the WDPT were classified according to Doerr et al. (2006) classification (Table 1). All the experiments were conducted under controlled laboratory conditions (22 °C, 60 % relative humidity) to avoid the effects of temperature and humidity in the measurements (Doerr et al., 2002). Two undisturbed soil samples in 100 cm³ cylinders from the WDPT experimental sites were taken from the soil surface (0–5 cm) before the experiments in similar conditions to calculate the soil water content by the gravimetric method and the bulk density in the laboratory.

Table 1. WDPT classes and class increments used in the present study (after Doerr et al., 2006)

3.3 Erosion plots

A total of 8 closed plots were installed in the experimental area distributed as follow: 4 plots in North and South-facing aspect (N and S), and in each slope 2 of them located in shrub-covered (SC) areas and 2 in inter-shrub areas (IS). These IS areas were often covered by a thick litter layer in the north-facing hillslope and by annual vegetation in the south-facing one. Plots had a surface of 2 m² and they were rectangular-shaped and delimited by steel sheets. The steel sheet at the bottom of the plot was performed in a funnel shape in order to enable the conduction runoff to the collector linked to a deposit of 25L. The deposits were emptied manually after every wet spell and the volume collected was noted. The runoff collected was homogenised and a sample of 0.5L was taken and transported to the laboratory, where it was sieved at a 2 mm mesh and dried in the oven, in order to measure the amount of fine sediments transported by the runoff. The parameters calculated were runoff rate (R_r , mm), runoff coefficient (R_c , %), sediment concentration (S_c , gr l⁻¹) and soil loss (S_l , gr m⁻²). Although the plots were installed on September 2009,

Comentario [24]: Remove this paragraph

Comentario [25]: 4

Comentario [26]: Remove

Comentario [27]: Explain better

Comentario [28]: Of??

158 data records were not started until three months later in order to avoid disturbances caused by the soil
159 modifications during the plot installation.

160

161 3.4 Statistical procedures

162

163 The adjustment of data to normal distribution was tested using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, whereas the
164 Barlett test was performed to determine if the data accomplished the homocedasticity criteria. If these criteria
165 were not satisfied, the logarithmical transformation was attempted. ANOVA test was used if the data were
166 suitable to support parametric statistic and the U Mann-Whitney test was used if they did not. The effects of
167 factors “aspect”, “cover” (vegetal cover) and “season” were tested on SWR, runoff and soil loss data using the
168 above-mentioned analyses. Moreover the relation between precipitation parameters and runoff and soil loss
169 was performed by mean of regression models. The significance level was set at 0.05, and all analyses were
170 performed using R software (R Core Team, 2013).

171

172 4 Results

173

174 4.1 Precipitation analysis

175

176 The period analyzed comprised from 15/11/2009 to 15/12/2010. The daily precipitation during this period
177 is represented in the figure 2, as well as the mean and maximum intensity in a 10 minutes basis.

178

179 Figure 2. Daily precipitation (P), mean intensity (I) and maximum intensity (I_{max}) during the study period.

180

181 Precipitation during the study period followed the classic trend of Mediterranean climates of the northern
182 hemisphere, with a three-month-long drought between June and September, although precipitation from
183 December 2009 to April 2010 (921.2 mm) far exceeded the historical average for the corresponding
184 months (306.5 mm).

185 In order to facilitate analysis, the rainy period was split into two categories called transition and wet
186 seasons. This was done based on the precipitation characteristics more related with the main objective of
187 this study. Two transition seasons were differentiated lasting from 15/11/2009 to 15/12/2009 and from
188 01/09/2010 to 15/11/2010, respectively. They comprised the isolated precipitation events typical of
189 autumn in the study area. These seasons had a total rainfall of 107.9 mm, with wet periods of 1 or 2 days
190 (mean 1.3 ± 0.4 days) being usually separated by several days without rain (mean 5.7 ± 4.7 days). The
191 maximum daily rainfall (17 September 2009) was 41.1 mm ($I_{max} 36.6 \text{ mm h}^{-1}$; $I 9.1 \text{ mm h}^{-1}$). The wet
192 seasons occurred from 16/12/2009 to 30/04/2010 and from 15/11/2010 to 15/12/2010. Both periods were
193 characterized by series of several rainy days (mean duration 3.5 ± 2.5 days) separated by short periods
194 without rainfall (mean duration 2.5 ± 2.5 days). Rainfall of 30 mm day^{-1} was frequently exceeded (11
195 times). The maximum I_{max} occurred on 17 April 2010 (45.6 mm h^{-1}), while the maximum I_d (6.1 mm h^{-1})
196 occurred on 25 January 2010. The change of season in 2009 was provoked by a period of 9 days with a
197 total precipitation of 232.1mm. This change in 2010 was motivated due to a wet spell of 7 consecutive
198 days with a total precipitation of 80.2mm. The period between 01/05/2010 and 31/08/2010 was not taken
199 into account since only some small events ($P < 2 \text{ m}$) were registered and runoff was not observed.

200

201 4.2 Soil water repellency

Comentario [29]: I think this section is not clear. Can you organize data in a different way or add a table including this data?

202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245

Figure 3 shows the SWR values measured in every microenvironment and season. SWR data did not accomplish the normality and homoscedasticity criteria required for ANOVA analysis; hence U Mann-Whitney test was performed to compare pairs of means taking into account independently aspect, season and cover. Factors "aspect" and "season" had significant effect on SWR ($p < 0.001$), whereas "cover" did not ($p > 0.05$). Repellency was higher in the north-facing hillslope and, in general, its values were higher during the transition season, decreasing significantly once the wet season started. This reduction of SWR was not observed in the case of bare soil areas of the south-facing hillslopes, given that soils were already wettable during the transition season.

Figure 3. SWR measured on every microenvironment and season. Note the logarithmic scale in the y-axis. Error bars represent standard deviation. NIS: North-facing inter-shrub; NSC: North-facing shrub-covered; SIS: South-facing inter-shrub; SSC: South-facing shrub-covered.

If data are separated by aspect and season, as previous analysis suggests to do, significant differences in SWR between covers in the transition season appeared in both hillslopes ($p < 0.001$); these differences were masked in the general analysis by the data of the wet season, when mean values of SWR remained homogeneous in both hillslopes ($p > 0.05$). This fact is clearly showed in figure 3 and was corroborated by a kruskal-Wallis analysis of SWR with the variable "microenvironment" (conjunction of aspect and cover) on every season (Table 2). In the transition season there were significant differences between microenvironments ($p < 0.001$) and the pairwise U Mann-Whitney test showed differences within every hillslope. In the wet season, the soil remained wettable in all the cases but there were quantitative differences between microenvironments ($p < 0.05$). In this period, there were no differences within every hillslope.

Table 2. Quantitative and qualitative values of SWR. WDPT: Water drop penetration time; NIS: North-facing inter-shrub; NSC: North-facing shrub-covered; SIS: South-facing inter-shrub; SSC: South-facing shrub-covered. Different letters denote significant differences between microenvironments in every season.

4.3 Hydrological and erosive response

Table 3 shows means and standard deviations of the hydrological and erosive parameters recorded during the study period. The dispersion of data was large, usually with CV values higher than 100%. In the transition season NIS plots showed the highest mean values for runoff variables ($R_r = 2.99$ mm, $R_p = 12.22\%$) and SSC showed the lowest ones (0.35 mm, 1.27%). The maximum event values during this season were also measured in the NIS plots (8.51 mm, 19.33%), after 44 mm of precipitation with $I = 2.7$ mm h⁻¹ and $I_{max} = 36.6$ mm h⁻¹. During the wet season, there was a change of trend and the highest mean values were in SIS plots (1.49 mm, 2.59%), whereas the lowest occurred in the NSC plots (0.15 mm, 0.23%). The maximum event values in this season were recorded in the SIS plots (6.34 mm, 11.77%) after 53.9 mm of precipitation ($I = 2.9$ mm h⁻¹ and $I_{max} = 44.4$ mm h⁻¹).

Regarding the sediment concentration, the highest mean value in the transition season was 0.91 gr l⁻¹ and it was found both in NIS and SSC plots. On the other hand the lowest value was 0.25 gr l⁻¹ in the SIS plots. In the wet season the maximum mean value was 0.59 gr l⁻¹ in the SSC plots and the lowest one was 0.08

- Comentario [30]: remove
- Comentario [31]: remove
- Comentario [32]: remove
- Comentario [33]: remove
- Comentario [34]: Move this paragraph to the discussion section

- Comentario [35]: g
- Comentario [36]: g

246 gr l^{-1} in the NIS plots. The maximum sediment concentration measured in the transition season was 3.76
247 gr l^{-1} (NIS plots), recorded after a short event of 2.9 mm ($I=3.6 \text{ mm h}^{-1}$, $I_{\text{max}}=6 \text{ mm h}^{-1}$). In the wet season
248 it was 2.59 gr l^{-1} (SSH plots), after 14.7 mm of precipitation ($I=1.9 \text{ mm h}^{-1}$, $I_{\text{max}}=4.8 \text{ mm h}^{-1}$).
249 Lastly, mean soil loss in the transition season was higher in NIS plots (0.91 gr m^{-2}), as a result of the high
250 runoff rate and sediment concentration, and lower in the SIS plots. Soil loss in the wet season was higher
251 in the SIS plots (0.37 gr m^{-2}) and lower in the NSC plots (0.02 gr m^{-2}). The maximum measurements was
252 recorded in the same event and microenvironment previously described for the maximum values of the
253 runoff variables and they were 2.69 and 2.62 gr m^{-2} in the transition and wet seasons, respectively.

Comentario [37]: g

Comentario [38]: g

Comentario [39]: g

Comentario [40]: g

Comentario [41]: g

Comentario [42]: g

Comentario [43]: g

254
255 Table 3. Summary of precipitation and soil hydrological and erosive response. NIS: North-facing inter-
256 shrub; NSC: North-facing shrub-covered; SIS: South-facing inter-shrub; SSC: South-facing shrub-
257 covered; P: Precipitation; I: Mean rainfall intensity; I_{max} : Maximum rainfall intensity; R_r : Runoff rate; R_c :
258 Runoff coefficient; S_c : Sediment concentration; S_f : Soil loss.

259 4.3.1 Factors affecting runoff

260
261
262 ANOVA analyses showed that the only individual factor that affected runoff rate was “cover” ($p = 0.009$),
263 whereas “aspect” and “season” did not have any significant effect. Effectively, runoff rate was clearly
264 different in shrub covered ($0.47 \pm 0.67 \text{ mm}$) and inter-shrub soils ($1.54 \pm 2.14 \text{ mm}$). This confirmed the
265 expected trend of more amount of runoff generated in bare soils than in shrub-covered ones. Interestingly,
266 the interaction of “aspect” and “season” affected significantly the runoff rate ($p = 0.03$), what means that
267 the changes in runoff rate between seasons were different depending on the hillslope considered. In both
268 microenvironments of the north-facing hillslope runoff rate was lower during the wet season (Figure 4A),
269 whereas in the south-facing hillslope this was not observed, being the runoff rate lower in the transition
270 season (slightly in the inter-shrub plots). Due to the large dispersion of data, only in bare soils of the
271 north-facing hillslope the difference in runoff rate between seasons was significant.
272 Regarding the runoff coefficient (Figure 4B), both “cover” ($p < 0.01$) and “season” ($p < 0.001$) had
273 significant effect on this property, being R_c higher during the transition season and in those patches
274 without shrubs. “Aspect” as a single factor did not have any effect. If the analysis was performed to check
275 the differences between seasons on every microenvironment, it resulted that there were significant
276 differences on both microenvironments of the north-facing hillslope, whereas in the south-facing one they
277 were not found. In spite of having no effect as an individual factor, “aspect” is an important variable to
278 take into account for the runoff analysis, since R_c is homogeneous during the year in the south-facing
279 hillslope but heterogeneous in the north-facing one. As a consequence, R_c was higher in the north-facing
280 hillslope during the transition season and in the south-facing hillslope during the wet season (Figure 4B).

Comentario [44]: This is very ambiguous, please rewrite the sentence

281
282 Figure 4. Mean values of runoff rate and coefficient in every microenvironment and season. Error bars
283 represent standard deviation. NIS: North-facing inter-shrub; NSC: North-facing shrub-covered; SIS:
284 South-facing inter-shrub; SSC: South-facing shrub-covered.

285 4.3.2 Precipitation and runoff

286
287
288 Once we analysed the differences in runoff rate and coefficient between aspects, vegetal cover and season,
289 we tried to elucidate the precipitation property that best correlated with the overland flow in our study site.

Comentario [45]: I think that this section can be joined to the 4.3.1

290 Among the rainfall parameter analysed, the best correlation with the runoff rate was found for I_{\max} .
291 Interestingly, in the north-facing hillslope the hydrological behavior was different during the transition
292 and the wet seasons (Figure 5 A and B). In inter-shrub soils, the relation between I_{\max} and runoff rate was
293 significant ($p < 0.01$) for the whole set of events but it improved when data were split between seasons,
294 turning the R^2 coefficient from 0.49 for the complete dataset, to 0.93 and 0.61 for the transition and wet
295 season respectively. Moreover, the I_{\max} threshold for runoff generation increased from 4.9 mm in the
296 transition season to 6.4 mm in the wet season, whereas the slope of the relation I_{\max} - R_r decreased 2.7
297 times, from 0.254 to 0.093 (Figure 5A and Table 4). The relation between P and R_r was weaker and it only
298 was significant in the transition season. Beneath *Cistus* spp. the relation between runoff rate and I_{\max} was
299 not significant when we took into account the whole study period ($p > 0.05$, $R^2 = 0.08$). However,
300 interestingly, when we split the data between seasons, this relation became significant only in the
301 transition season ($p < 0.05$, $R^2 = 0.77$), whereas in the wet season it remained not significant ($p > 0.05$,
302 $R^2 = 0.17$). In this case, the relation between P and runoff rate was significant in the wet season ($p < 0.05$,
303 $R^2 = 0.4$), indicating a change in the runoff generation mechanisms.

304 In the south-facing hillslope (Figure 5 C-D, and Table 4), there was a good and significant relation
305 between runoff rate and I_{\max} ($p < 0.001$) in inter-shrub patches, as well beneath shrubs. This relation was
306 consistent along the entire study period and the points corresponding to the transition season are
307 straightened to the points of the wet season. In bare soil the R^2 was 0.86 and beneath shrubs was 0.70. As
308 it occurred in the bare soil environment of the north-facing hillslope, the relation of runoff rate with P was
309 weaker than the relation with I_{\max} , so the later was the main controlling rainfall factor affecting the runoff
310 generation. In both microenvironments of the south-facing hillslope, the I_{\max} threshold for runoff
311 generation and the slope of the relation I_{\max} - R_r only registered slight variations. It is important to highlight
312 that the relation I_{\max} - R_r in inter-shrub soils of the south-facing hillslope was not significant during the
313 transition season, in spite of the high R^2 of 0.91. This was due to some missing data caused by the effect
314 of grazing on the erosion plots. Nevertheless, since the relation was apparently good, we took into account
315 the parameters of the regression models, although with all due caution.

316
317 Figure 5. Relation between I_{\max} and runoff in every microenvironment. NIS: North-facing inter-shrub;
318 NSC: North-facing shrub-covered; SIS: South-facing inter-shrub; SSC: South-facing shrub-covered.

319
320 Table 4. Relevant parameters of the regression models performing the relation between I_{\max} and R_r . I_{\max}
321 threshold is the I_{\max} necessary to generate runoff. * denotes significance ($p < 0.05$).

322
323 No significant relation was found between % of runoff and precipitation parameters, but interestingly,
324 when it was plotted against P and I_{\max} , two clearly different groups of points according to the season could
325 be observed in the north-facing hillslope, whereas in the south-facing hillslope this different response did
326 not exist (Figures 6 and 7).

327
328 Figure 6. Relation between % of runoff and precipitation. NIS: North-facing inter-shrub; NSC: North-
329 facing shrub-covered; SIS: South-facing inter-shrub; SSC: South-facing shrub-covered.

330
331 Figure 7. Relation between % of runoff and I_{\max} . NIS: North-facing inter-shrub; NSC: North-facing shrub-
332 covered; SIS: South-facing inter-shrub; SSC: South-facing shrub-covered.

333

334 4.3.3 Sediment concentration and soil loss

335
336 Sediment concentration and soil loss had a similar behaviour in this study. According to the ANOVA test,
337 the only factor that had a statistically significant effect on the erosion variables was “season”. In spite of
338 the lacking of statically significant differences, it is noteworthy the contrasting behavior of the sediment
339 concentration and soil loss in the two hillslope depending on the season considered (Figure 8 A-B). The
340 decrease observed in both parameters was much higher in the north-facing hillslope than in the south
341 facing one.

342 It can be observed that in three out of four microenvironments (SIS was the exception) there was a large
343 decrease of sediment concentration and soil loss when the transition to the wet season were compared
344 (Figure 8 A-B). Sediment concentration and soil loss did not show any significant relation with any of the
345 precipitation parameters studied.

Comentario [46]: This is not supported by results, please rewrite completely this section.

346
347 Figure 8. Mean values of sediment concentration and soil loss in every microenvironment and season.
348 Error bars represent standard deviation. NIS: North-facing inter-shrub; NSC: North-facing shrub-covered;
349 SIS: South-facing inter-shrub; SSC: South-facing shrub-covered.

350

351 5 Discussion

352

353 5.1 Soil water repellency

354

355 SWR results highlighted the seasonal character of this property, reported widely in the literature in
356 temperate humid areas as well in semiarid environments (Witter et al., 1991; Doerr et al., 2000; Kaiser et
357 al., 2001; Benito et al., 2003; Whal, 2008; Zavala et al., 2009). SWR is commonly associated to dry soils
358 and it is supposed to disappear when soil water content increase to a critical soil moisture threshold
359 (Crockford et al., 1991; Imeson et al., 1992; Ritsema and Dekker, 1994; Doerr et al., 2000). SWR results
360 were consistent with this statement and after the summer drought, three out of four microenvironments
361 showed hydrophobicity and only one of them remained wettable, whereas during the wet season all the
362 microenvironments were wettable. The SWR measurements corresponding to the transition season was
363 done just after the 2009 dry season and in consequence soil moisture was clearly below the wilting point
364 at that time. However, according to Doerr and Thomas (2000), soil drying by itself is not enough to restore
365 soil water repellency and the addition of fresh hydrophobic compounds is also needed. In the study area
366 the dominant species are *Cistus albidus* and *Cistus monspeliensis*. They are seasonal dimorphic species
367 (Aronne and De Micco, 2001), an adaptation to the Mediterranean summer drought (Orshan, 1964, 1972)
368 that involves the cessation of dolichoblast growth at the end of spring, flower formation, and leaf
369 abscission in order to avoid transpiration water loss. Hence, abundant litter accumulates on the topsoil
370 beneath the shrubs and in surrounding areas during summer (Gabarrón-Galeote et al., 2013). Moreover,
371 this litter is rich in wax and oil compounds, frequently associated to SWR appearance (Verheijen and
372 Cammeraat, 2007).

373 The differences in litter input would explain the contrasts between and within hillslopes. On one hand, in
374 the north-facing hillslopes shrubs covered a.c. 75% of the hillslope, consequently there were no true bare
375 soil areas because the great amount of litter produced covered the patches between shrubs (Gabarrón-
376 Galeote et al., 2012). Thus, there was a high input of hydrophobic compounds, more abundant in the shrub
377 covered areas, that triggered SWR when soils became dry. On the other hand, in the south-facing hillslope

378 shrub-cover was rather discontinuous and there were large patches where the litter layer was absent. These
379 areas are covered by annual vegetation during the wet season. We expected to find SWR also due to the
380 annual vegetation growth, as it was reported by Martinez-Murillo and Ruiz-Sinoga (2007) in the same
381 study site, but the values obtained in the present study are lower. This might be caused by an extremely
382 rainy previous year to their measurements (1081 mm) that caused an extraordinary vegetation growth and
383 a higher than average litter production during that summer. In contrast, precipitation during the year
384 previous to our study was 528 mm.

385 The values of SWR in the wet season are consistent to the seasonal behavior of SWR. Crockford et al.
386 (1991) reported that only 9 days without rain during the wet season were enough to provoke repellent
387 conditions in the soil. The wet season in our study was rainier than usual and the mean duration of dry
388 spells was 2.5 days, so we can expect permanent wettable conditions along this season. Thus, there was a
389 heterogeneous pattern of soil water repellency related to vegetation cover and litter input (Doerr et al.,
390 1998) during the transition season that turned into homogeneous and wettable during the wet season.

391

392 5.2 Runoff generation

393

394 During the transition season, the maximum values of runoff rate took place in the north-facing hillslope in
395 both environments, whereas in the wet season the maximum values took place in the vegetated areas,
396 independently of aspect. This suggests a change in the factor controlling runoff generation. As it happened
397 with SWR, hydrological behavior was different between hillslopes. Soil water repellency has been proven
398 to have significant effects on the soil hydrological response, on the runoff generation as well as on soil
399 erosion (Doerr et al., 2003, Shakesby et al., 2000). However, these effects are not always of the same
400 magnitude and they are strongly dependent on the continuity of the repellent layer and the cracks and
401 pores on the soil surface.

402 In the North-facing hillslope, overland flow was higher in the bare patches than beneath shrubs, and two
403 clearly contrasting soil responses were observed along the hydrological year. At a plot scale, all the
404 hydrological variables (R_s , R_p , S_c and S_i) were significantly higher in the transition season. The change of
405 conditions was observed not only in the mean values of rate and % of runoff, but in the correlation of
406 these properties with precipitation. On one hand, the slope of the relation between runoff rate and I_{max}
407 was clearly different between seasons in both microenvironments. On the other hand, the events with higher R_c
408 occurred in the transition season, being independent of precipitation. This seasonal behavior of overland
409 flow in Mediterranean conditions could be related to soil crust formation (Nunes et al., 2010), but soil
410 surface layer in the north-facing hillslope had more than 5% of organic matter, so surface crusting was not
411 the reason of the enhanced overland flow (Hillel 1998, Beven, 2001), this suggests SWR as the more
412 probable cause (Doerr et al., 2003). The strong influence of SWR on runoff generation during the
413 transition season was studied in the same hillslope by Gabarron-Galeote et al. (2012) by mean of rainfall
414 simulations. They obtained runoff in the 100% and 60% of the experiments developed in bare soil and
415 beneath shrubs respectively. When runoff is a consequence of SWR, it is generated by Hortonian
416 mechanisms, since the wettability of the soil surface decreases dramatically (De Bano, 1971). Indeed, the
417 significant relation between I_{max} of the event and the runoff rate suggests that runoff is mainly generated
418 by Hortonian mechanisms in the north-facing hillslope during the transition season. The fact that the R_c
419 was higher in NIS (12.22%) than in NSC environments (5.26%), whereas SWR was moderate and severe
420 respectively, was probably caused by the presence of more macropores due to root development of shrubs
421 in NSC patches. These macropores caused discontinuities in the repellent layer and allowed the runoff

Comentario [47]: This can be supported with new references like this article: Santos, J. M., Verheijen, F. G. A., Tavares Wahren, F., Wahren, A., Feger, K.-H., Bernard-Jannin, L., Rial-Rivas, M. E., Keizer, J. J. and Nunes, J. P. (2013), SOIL WATER REPELLENCY DYNAMICS IN PINE AND EUCALYPT PLANTATIONS IN PORTUGAL – A HIGH-RESOLUTION TIME SERIES. Land Degrad. Dev.. doi: 10.1002/ldr.2251

422 generated to reinfiltrate within the plot and reach the hydrophilic layer beneath the repellent one. This kind
423 of discontinuities, due to macropores as well as to a patchy pattern of SWR, is the cause of the low
424 response to runoff generated in repellent conditions at the catchment level (Doerr et al., 2003). In the
425 study mentioned above, Gabarron-Galeote et al. (2012) found that macropores were the main infiltration
426 way during rainfall simulations when soil surface is repellent. The I_{\max} threshold for runoff generation was
427 higher in the bare patches, a result consistent with the lower SWR.

428 SWR disappeared in the wet season and the hydrological response also changed clearly. Relations
429 between runoff rate and I_{\max} were weaker, what suggested that under hydrophilic conditions the formation
430 of Hortonian overland flow was prevented, and the lower runoff of this season was produced by saturation
431 of the shallow soil (Shakesby et al., 2000), favored by the extremely wet season of the year 2009-2010. In
432 fact, in the NSC patches the relation of runoff with I_{\max} disappeared, whereas the relation with P became
433 significant. In a study of Doerr et al. (2003), developed in an area with similar topographical and
434 geological characteristics, but significantly more rainy, the hydrological response at plot scale during the
435 wet season was similar to the reported here in the north-facing hillslope. They detected only 1 out of 60
436 events with more than 3% of runoff during the wet season, whereas our maximum value was 2.26%.

437 Doerr et al. (2003) also pointed out that only in very wet conditions could be developed saturation
438 overland flow, due to the saturation of the relatively shallow soil. This statement is also applicable to the
439 Almogía north-facing hillslope of our experimental area.

440 In the south-facing hillslope there were no significant differences in rate and % of runoff between seasons,
441 neither in the relation between I_{\max} and runoff rate. However, there were some remarkable differences
442 between microenvironments that are important to highlight. In the transition season the runoff was 3.06 %
443 and 1.27 % in inter-shrub and vegetated patches, respectively. These values are both lower than the
444 corresponding ones in the north-facing hillslope. In the bare patches this fact seems reasonable since soils
445 are wettable even in the transition season. So although in absence of SWR soil conditions of this layer are
446 less favorable to promote infiltration as they are in the north-facing hillslope (soils less developed, with
447 low organic matter content and hydraulic conductivity (Martinez-Murillo et al., 2007)), a lower overland
448 flow was detected. In addition, annual vegetation created paths that favor infiltration of the generated
449 runoff. Regarding the shrub covered areas, they showed moderated SWR during the transition season but,
450 surprisingly, the lower overland flow was measured here. This can be explained by the vegetation
451 allocation on the south-facing hillslope. The non-uniform distribution of vegetated areas promotes the
452 spatial concentration of soil moisture, nutrients and biological activity beneath shrubs (Mou et al., 1995;
453 Pan et al., 1998; Anderson et al., 2004; Puigdefábregas, 2005). At the same time soil fertility is reduced in
454 inter-shrub areas because of erosion and gas emission processes. The availability of nutrients and water
455 resources favor the growth and survival of vegetation, which is a feedback process (Pugnaire et al., 1996;
456 Cerdá, 1997; Holmgren et al., 1997) that continuously improves the soil properties of so-called fertility
457 islands (Schlesinger et al., 1990). This process is reinforced because of the more frequent hydrological
458 response of inter-shrub soil areas under Mediterranean conditions: source of runoff, sediments and
459 nutrients. When these sediments are transported down-slope they are usually retained in adjacent
460 vegetated areas, where they contribute to the improvement of soil properties, and therefore vegetation
461 growth (Cammaraat, 2004; Ludwig et al., 2005; Puigdefábregas, 2005). Due to the good soil conditions
462 and the biological activity, Hortonian overland flow generated due to repellent conditions was rapidly
463 reinfiltrated through animal burrows (Garkaklis et al., 1998), root channels and macropores (Sevink et al.,
464 1989; Doerr et al., 2003) and there was no connectivity between the small patches source of runoff even at
465 a plot scale.

466 During the wet season no SWR was detected and runoff was of 2.59 % in bare patches and 0.96 % in
467 vegetated areas. These values are consistent with fertility island theory formerly explained and are a direct
468 consequence of the infiltration capacity and the quality of soils.

469 It is difficult to elucidate the runoff generation mechanism in south-facing hillslopes of the study area. In
470 similar conditions, Martínez-Murillo and Ruiz-Sinoga (2007) found differences in runoff rate generated as
471 well as in the mechanisms between seasons in south-facing exposures. The differences in runoff generated
472 were justified because they found water repellency in the transition season in both microenvironments.
473 They pointed out that during the wet season runoff was produced by saturation mechanisms. In our case,
474 the consistent relation between I_{max} and runoff rate could suggest Hortonian runoff generation, but in
475 absence of soil water repellency overland flow by saturation of the shallow soil cannot be discarded
476 (Shakesby et al., 2000).

477 To sum up, during the transition season SWR was the main factor controlling overland flow generation,
478 especially in the north-facing hillslope, whereas in the wet season runoff generation depended mainly on
479 the soil properties that favor infiltration (e.g. organic matter, aggregate stability), determined by the
480 vegetal cover.

481

482 5.3 Sediments and soil loss

483

484 Sediment transport was higher during the transition season in the three microenvironments where soil
485 water repellency was detected. Actually, the factor “season” was the only one that affected the erosion
486 variables measured. The causes of this increase of soil erosion in repellent soils are the enhanced splash
487 erosion (Terry and Shakesby, 1993; Ahn et al., 2013). According to Ahn et al. (2013), soil water
488 repellency increases the distance of ejection of particles after a drop impact, what in hillslopes with a
489 certain degree of inclination involves greater net downslope movement and hence net erosion of particles.
490 Shakesby et al. (2000) reported that in hydrophilic soils the wetting provoked an increase in the particles
491 cohesion and a compact surface seal, that limited the amounts of splashed sediments, was developed. On
492 the contrary, in hydrophobic soils, soils particles remained dry and easily detachable.

493 During the transition season a larger sediment transport in the repellent microenvironments was observed,
494 but it did not follow the same order than SWR or overland flow. In fact, sediment transport does not have
495 to be necessarily proportional to these factors (Shakesby et al., 2000), since it also depends on the
496 availability of sediments and the capacity of water to move them. For example, overland flow in vegetated
497 areas was larger in the north-facing hillslope, meanwhile soil loss was higher in the south-facing one. This
498 is a consequence of the high availability of sediments in the later areas, that receive sediments from the
499 adjacent bare areas in the wet season. Moreover, the thick layer of litter in the north-facing hillslope also
500 prevented the sediment movement, since the energy of raindrops decreases before impacting soil particles
501 (Casermeiro et al., 2004). Under Mediterranean climate, Nunes et al. (2010) also detected more erosion in
502 the dry period in herbaceous, shrubland and oak-tree areas, although they attributed this fact to crust
503 formation instead of soil water repellency.

504 During the wet season, with wettable soil conditions, the same scheme was repeated in both hillslope:
505 runoff generated beneath shrubs had more sediment concentration due to the higher sediment availability
506 but, given that overland flow was larger in bare areas, soil losses were also larger in these
507 microenvironments. The causes for the high availability of sediments in shrub covered plots are
508 (Martínez-Murillo and Ruiz-Sinoga, 2007): i) the inter-shrub areas are more frequently washed by runoff,
509 ii) the washed sediments are deposited beneath shrubs and they are only transported when the precipitation

510 event is strong or intense enough. Similar spatial relationships between sediment yield, vegetation and
511 bare soil were found by Puigdefábregas and Sánchez (1996a) and Puigdefábregas (1998, 1999).

512 513 6 Conclusions

514
515 Aspect was a key factor determining the hydrological and erosive response throughout the year in the
516 experimental area. This influence was exerted through the vegetation pattern, that in turn depended
517 strongly on the hillslope exposure.

518 The north-facing hillslope was characterized by a rather continuous vegetation pattern and a greater litter
519 input in the soil, that triggered soil water repellency after the summer drought, in shrub covered as well as
520 in inter-shrub patches. Consequently, the soil hydrological response was homogeneous during the
521 transition season and high runoff coefficients and soil losses were measured in both microenvironments.
522 However, SWR had a marked seasonal behavior and when it disappeared the switch from repellent to
523 wettable conditions provoked a strong decrease of overland flow and erosion, and even a change in the
524 runoff generation mechanism, turning from Hortonian mechanisms in the transition season to soil
525 saturation mechanisms in the wet season.

526 In the south-facing hillslope there was a clearly patchy vegetation pattern. The areas covered by shrub also
527 showed soil water repellency after the summer drought but in this case its influence on the hydrological
528 response was mitigated by the soil conditions favouring reinfiltration. The patchy vegetation pattern
529 triggered a transfer of runoff and sediments from the inter-shrubs to the shrub covered areas, developing
530 fertility islands and improving soil conditions on the later ones (e.g. more organic matter, aggregate
531 stability, biological activity). In the present study, the south facing inter-shrub patches did not show SWR
532 even in the transition season As a consequence, in the south-facing hillslope no important seasonal
533 changes were detected on the hydrological and erosive soil response.

534 In conclusion, our results support that SWR has a significant influence on the soil hydrological response,
535 but at the same time this influence is dependent and modulated by factors as antecedent precipitation,
536 presence of macropores and other areas of reinfiltration, and soil structure. In the present study SWR
537 effects are important after the summer drought in the north-facing hillslope, where the hydrological
538 response was homogeneous in space and heterogeneous in time. In contrast the south-facing hillslope
539 hydrological behaviour was heterogeneous in space and homogeneous in time.

540 541 7 References

- 542
543 Anderson, T. M., McNaughton, S. J. and Ritchie, M. E.: Scale-dependent relationships between the spatial
544 distribution of a limiting resource and plant species diversity in an African grassland ecosystem, *Oecologia*, 139,
545 277-287, 2004.
- 546 Ahn, S., Doerr, S. H., Douglas, P., Bryant, R., Hamlett, C. A. E., McHale, G., Newton, M. I. and Shirtcliffe N. J.:
547 Effects of hydrophobicity on splash erosion of model soil particles by a single water drop impact, *Earth Surf. Proc.*
548 *Land.*, DOI: 10.1002/esp.3364, 2013.
- 549 Aronne, G. and De Micco, V.: Seasonal dimorphism in the Mediterranean *Cistus incanus* L. subsp. *incanus*, *Ann.*
550 *Bot.*, 87, 789-794, 2001.
- 551 Benito, E., Santiago, J. L., de Blas, E. and Varela, M. E.: Deforestation of water repellent soils in Galicia (NW of
552 Spain): effects on surface runoff and erosion under simulated rainfall, *Earth Surf. Proc. Land.*, 28, 245-255, 2003.
- 553 Beven, K. J.: *Rainfall-Runoff Modelling: The Primer*. Wiley: Chichester, 2001.
- 554 Cammeraat, L. H.: Scale dependent thresholds in hydrological and erosion response of a semi-arid catchment in

Comentario [48]: In my opinion this is the an important part of the discussion section. I think the authors may focus the discussion in this point, and try to explain better differences between seasonal changes and vegetation types. Please develop this section and add more references in order to contrast better different results.

Comentario [49]: This section must be, completely rewritten, this paragraph is very vague, the conclusions have to be solid, very clear and directly extracted from the results obtained.

Comentario [50]: I think this section can be improve adding more new references especially from the last two years, I think that most of references are older than 2005.

555 southeast Spain, *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, 104, 317-332, 2004.

556 Casermeiro, M., Molina, J., Caravaca, M., Costa, J., Massanet, M. and Moreno, P.: Influence of scrubs on runoff and
557 sediment loss in soils of Mediterranean climate, *Catena*, 57, 91-107, 2004.

558 Cerdà, A.: The effect of patchy distribution of *Stipa tenacissima* L. on runoff and erosion, *J. Arid. Environ.*, 36, 37-
559 51, 1997.

560 Crockford, S., Topalidis, S. and Richardson, D. P.: Water repellency in a dry sclerophyll forest — measurements and
561 processes, *Hydrol. Proces.*, 5, 405-420, 1991

562 DeBano, L. F.: The effect of hydrophobic substances on water movement in soil during infiltration, *Proc. Soil Sci.*
563 *Soc. Am.*, 35, 340-343, 1971.

564 Dekker, L.W., Doerr, S.H., Oostindie, K., Ziogas, A. K. and Ritsema, C. J.: Water repellency and critical soil water
565 content in a dune sand, *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 65, 1667-1674, 2001.

566 Doerr, S. H., Shakesby, R. A. and Walsh, R. P. D.: Spatial variability of soil water repellency in fire-prone
567 eucalyptus and pine forests, Portugal, *Soil Sci.*, 163, 313-324, 1998.

568 Doerr, S. H. and Thomas, A. D.: The role of soil moisture in controlling water repellency: new evidence from forest
569 soils in Portugal, *J. Hydrol.*, 231-232, 134-147, 2000.

570 Doerr, S. H., Shakesby, R. A. and Walsh, R. P. D.: Soil water repellency: its causes, characteristics and hydro-
571 geomorphological significance, *Earth Sci. Rev.*, 51, 33-65, 2000.

572 Doerr, S. H., Dekker, L. W., Ritsema, C. J., Shakesby, R. A. and Bryant, R.: Water repellency of soils: the influence
573 of ambient relative humidity, *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 66, 401-405, 2002.

574 Doerr, S. H., Ferreira, A. J. D., Walsh, R. P. D., Shakesby, R. A., Leighton-Boyce, G. and Coelho, C. O. A.: Soil
575 water repellency as a potential parameter in rainfall-runoff modelling: Experimental evidence at point to catchment
576 scales from Portugal. *Hydrol. Proces.*, 17, 363-377, 2003.

577 Doerr, S. H., Shakesby, R. A., Dekker, L. W. and Ritsema, C. J.: Occurrence, prediction and hydrological effects of
578 water repellency amongst major soil and land-use types in a humid temperate climate, *Eur. J. Soil Sci.*, 57, 741-
579 754, 2006.

580 Gabarrón-Galeote, M. A., Martínez-Murillo, J. F. and Ruiz-Sinoga, J. D.: Relevant effects of vegetal cover and litter
581 on the soil hydrological response of two contrasting Mediterranean hillslopes at the end of the dry season (south of
582 Spain), *Hydrol. Proces.*, 26, 1729-1738, 2012.

583 Gabarrón-Galeote, M. A., Ruiz-Sinoga, J. D. and Quesada, M. A.: Influence of aspect in soil and vegetation water
584 dynamics in dry Mediterranean conditions: functional adjustment of evergreen and semi-deciduous growth forms,
585 *Ecohydrol.*, 6, 241-255, 2013.

586 Garkaklis, M. J., Bradley, J. S. and Wooller, R. D.: The effects of woylie (*Bettongia penicillata*) foraging on soil
587 water repellency in heavy textured soils in southeastern Australia, *Aust. J. Ecol.*, 23, 492-496, 1998.

588 Hillel, D.: *Environmental Soil Physics*, Academic Press: London, 771, 1998.

589 Holmgren, M., Scheffer, M. and Huston, M. A.: The interplay of facilitation and competition in plant communities,
590 *Ecology*, 78, 1966-1975, 1997.

591 Imeson, A. C. and Verstraten, J. M.: The microaggregation and erodibility of some semi-arid and Mediterranean
592 soils, in: Yair, A. and Berkowicz, S. (Eds.), *Arid and Semi-arid Environments – Geomorphological and*
593 *Pedological Aspects*, Catena Verlag, Cremlingen, pp. 11-24, 1989.

594 Imeson, A. C. and Vis, M.: Factors influencing the aggregate stability of soils in natural and semi-natural ecosystems
595 at different altitudes in the Central Cordillera of Colombia. *ZeitschriftFürGeomorphologie N.F. Suppl. Bd.*, 44, 94-
596 105, 1982.

597 Imeson, A. C., Verstraten, J. M., Van Mullingen, E. J. and Sevink, J.: The effects of fire and water repellency on
598 infiltration and runoff under Mediterranean type forests, *Catena* 19, 345- 361, 1992.

599 Kaiser, K., Guggenberger, G., Haumaier, L. and Zech, W.: Seasonal variations in the chemical composition of
600 dissolved organic matter in organic forest floor leachates of old-growth Scots pine (*Pinussylvestris* L.) and
601 European beech (*Fagussylvatica* L.) stands in northeastern Bavaria, Germany, *Biogeochemistry*, 55, 103-143,
602 2001.

603 Klemmedson, J. O. and Wienhold, B. J.: Aspect and species influences on nitrogen and phosphorus in Arizona

604 chaparral soil-plant system. *Arid Soil Res. Rehab.*, 6, 105-116, 1992.

605 Kutiel, P.: Slope aspect effect on soil and vegetation in a Mediterranean ecosystem. *Isr. J. Bot.*, 41, 243-250, 1992.

606 Kutiel P. and Lavee H.: Effect of slope aspect on soil and vegetation properties along an aridity transect. *Isr. J. Plant*
607 *Sci.*, 47, 169-178, 1999.

608 Ludwig, J. A., Wilcox, B. P., Bresheards, D. D., Tongway, D. J. and Imeson, A. C.: Vegetation patches and runoff-
609 erosion as interacting ecohydrological processes in semiarid landscapes, *Ecology*, 86, 288-297, 2005.

610 Martínez-Murillo, J. F. and Ruiz-Sinoga, J. D.: Seasonal changes in the hydrological and erosional response of a
611 hillslope under dry- Mediterranean conditions (Montes de Málaga, South of Spain), *Geomorphology*, 88, 69-83,
612 2007.

613 Martínez-Murillo, J. F. and Ruiz-Sinoga, J. D.: Water repellency as run-off and soil detachment controlling factor in
614 a dry-Mediterranean hillslope (South of Spain), *Hydrol. Proces.*, 24, 2137-2142, 2010.

615 Martínez-Murillo, J. F., Gabarrón-Galeote, M. A. and Ruiz-Sinoga, J. D.: Soil water repellency in Mediterranean
616 rangelands under contrasted climatic, slope and patch conditions in southern Spain, *Catena*, 110, 196-206, 2013.

617 Moral García, F. J., Dekker, L. W., Oostindie, K. and Ritsema, C. J.: Water repellency under natural conditions in
618 sandy soils of southern Spain, *Aust. J. Soil Res.*, 43, 291-296, 2005.

619 Mou, P., Jones, R. H., Mitchell, R. J. and Zutter, B.: Spatial distribution of roots in sweetgum and loblolly pine
620 monocultures and relations with above-ground biomass and soil nutrients. *Funct. Ecol.*, 9, 689-699, 1995.

621 Nunes, A. N., Coelho, C. O. A., De Almeida, A. C. and Figueiredo, A.: Soil erosion and hydrological response to
622 land abandonment in a central inland area of Portugal, *Land Degrad. Dev.*, 21, 260-273, 2010.

623 Olivero, A. M. and Hix, D. M.: Influence of slope aspect and stand age on ground flora of southeastern Ohio forest
624 ecosystems, *Plant Ecol.*, 139, 177-187, 1998.

625 Orshan, G.: Seasonal dimorphism of desert and Mediterranean chamaephytes and its significance as a factor in their
626 water economy, in: Rutter, A.J. and Whitehead, F.H., (Eds.), *The water relations of plants*, Blackwell, Edinburgh,
627 pp. 206-222, 1964.

628 Orshan, G.: Morphological and physiological plasticity in relation to drought, *Proceedings of the International*
629 *Symposium on Wildland Shrub Biology and Utilization at Utah State University*, 245-254, 1972.

630 Pan, D. Y., Bouchard, A., Legendre, P. and Domon, G.: Influence of edaphic factors on the spatial structure of inland
631 halophytic communities: a case study in China, *J. Veg. Sci.*, 9, 797-804, 1998.

632 Pugnaire, F. I., Haase, P., Puigdefábregas, J., Cueto, M., Clark, S. C. and Incoll, L. D.: Facilitation and succession
633 under the canopy of a leguminous shrub, *Retamasphaerocarpa*, in a semi-arid environment in south-east Spain,
634 *Oikos*, 76, 455-464, 1996.

635 Puigdefábregas, J.: Ecological impacts of global change on drylands and their implications for desertification. *Land*
636 *Degrad. Dev.*, 9, 393-406, 1998.

637 Puigdefábregas, J.: The role of vegetation patterns in structuring runoff and sediment fluxes in drylands, *Earth Surf.*
638 *Proc. Land.*, 30, 133-147, 2005.

639 Puigdefábregas, J., Sánchez, G.: Geomorphological implications of vegetation patchiness on semi-arid slopes, in:
640 Anderson, M.G., Brooks, S. (Eds.), *Advances in Hillslope Processes*, vol. 2, Wiley, pp. 1027-1060, 1996.

641 Puigdefábregas, J., Solé, A., Gutiérrez, L., Del Barrio, G. and Boer, M.: Scales and processes of water and sediment
642 redistribution in drylands: results from the Rambla Honda field site in Southeast Spain, *Earth Sci. Rev.*, 48, 39-70,
643 1999.

644 R Core Team: R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing,
645 Vienna, Austria, <http://www.R-project.org/>, 2013.

646 Ritsema, C. J. and Dekker, L. W.: How water moves in a water repellent sandy soil: 2. Dynamics of fingered flow,
647 *Water Resour. Res.*, 30, 2519-2531, 1994.

648 Schlesinger, W. H., Reynolds, J. F., Cunningham, G. L., Huenneke, L. F., Jarrell, W. M., Virginia, R. A. and
649 Whitford, W. G.: Biological feedbacks in global desertification, *Science*, 247, 1043-1048, 1990.

650 Sevink, J., Imeson, A. C. and Verstraten, J. M.: Humus form development and hillslope runoff, and the effects of fire
651 and management, under Mediterranean forest in N.E. Spain, *Catena*, 16, 461-475, 1989.

652 Shakesby, R. A., Doerr, S. H. and Walsh, R. P. D.: The erosional impact of soil hydrophobicity: current problems

653 and future research directions, *J. Hydrol.*, 231–232, 178-191, 2000.

654 Terry, J. P. and Shakesby, R. A.: Soil hydrophobicity effects on rainsplash: simulated rainfall and photographic
655 evidence. *Earth Surf. Proc. Land.*, 18, 519-525, 1993.

656 Trabaud, L.: Man and fire: Impacts on Mediterranean vegetation, in: di Castri, F., Goodall, D. W. and Specht, R.L.
657 (Eds.), *Mediterranean-Type Shrublands*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 523-537, 1981.

658 Van'tWoudt, B. D.: Particle coatings affecting the wettability of soils. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 64, 263-267, 1959.

659 Verheijen, F. and Cammeraat, L. H.: The association between three dominant shrub species and water repellent soils
660 along a range of soil moisture contents in semiarid Spain, *Hydrol. Proces.*, 21, 2310-2316, 2007.

661 Whal, N. A.: Variability of water repellency on sandy forest soils under broadleaves and conifers in north-western
662 Jutland/Denmark, *Soil Water Res.*, 3, S155-S164, 2008.

663 Witter, J.V., Jungerius, P. D. and ten Harkel, M. J.: Modelling water erosion and the impact of water-repellency,
664 *Catena*, 18, 115-124, 1991.

665 Zavala, L. M., González, F. A. and Jordán, A.: Intensity and persistence of water repellency in relation to vegetation
666 types and soil parameters in Mediterranean SW Spain, *Geoderma* 152, 361-374, 2009.

667

668

Table 1. WDPT classes and class increments used in the present study (after Doerr et al., 2006)

WDPT class	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
WDPT intervals (s)	≤5	6-10	11-30	31-60	61-180	181-300	301-600	601-900	901-3600	3601-18000	>18000
Persistence rating	Wettable		Slight		Moderate			Severe		Extreme	

669

Comentario [51]: I think this table is not necessary

670 Table 2. Quantitative and qualitative values of SWR. WDPT: Water drop penetration time; NIS: North-
 671 facing inter-shrub; NSC: North-facing shrub-covered; SIS: South-facing inter-shrub; SSC: South-facing
 672 shrub-covered. Different letters denote significant differences between microenvironments in every
 673 season.

Micro environment	Transition season		Wet season	
	WDPT (sg)	Category	WDPT (sg)	Category
NIS	130.6±96.2 b	4 Moderate	5.5±3.2 a	0 Wettable
NSC	797.0±627.1 a	7 Severe	3.8±1.5ab	0 Wettable
SIS	4.3±1.7 c	0 Wettable	3.6±1.5ab	0 Wettable
SSC	77±46.7 b	4 Moderate	2.8±0.6 b	0 Wettable

Comentario [52]: remove

Comentario [53]: remove

674

675 Table 3. Summary of precipitation and soil hydrological and erosive response. NIS: North-facing inter-
 676 shrub; NSC: North-facing shrub-covered; SIS: South-facing inter-shrub; SSC: South-facing shrub-
 677 covered; P: Precipitation; I: Mean rainfall intensity; I_{max} : Maximum rainfall intensity; R_r : Runoff rate; R_c :
 678 Runoff coefficient; S_c : Sediment concentration; S_l : Soil loss.

Total	P (mm)	921.2			
	I (mm)	3.1±1.2			
	I_{max} (mm)	18.7±13.5			
	Microenv	NIS	NSC	SIS	SSC
	R_r (mm)	1.74±2.26	0.47±0.76	1.31±1.88	0.47±0.51
	R_c (%)	4.83±5.72	1.71±2.63	2.69±3.32	1.06±0.87
	S_c (gr l ⁻¹)	0.32±0.86	0.23±0.29	0.30±0.18	0.66±0.66
S_l (gr m ⁻²)	0.32±0.63	0.15±0.31	0.32±0.66	0.28±0.29	
Transition season	P (mm)	107.9			
	I (mm)	3.2±0.3			
	I_{max} (mm)	16.7±10.9			
	Microenv	NIS	NSC	SIS	SSC
	R_r (mm)	2.99±2.86	1.24±1.04	0.66±0.49	0.35±0.32
	R_c (%)	12.22±4.95	5.26±2.33	3.06±1.84	1.27±1.06
	S_c (gr l ⁻¹)	0.91±1.42	0.49±0.38	0.25±0.05	0.91±0.37
S_l (gr m ⁻²)	0.91±0.91	0.43±0.45	0.14±0.09	0.58±0.39	
Wet season	P (mm)	813.3			
	I (mm)	3.1±1.4			
	I_{max} (mm)	19.6±14.4			
	Microenv	NIS	NSC	SIS	SSC
	R_r (mm)	1.22±1.71	0.15±0.17	1.49±2.07	0.53±0.57
	R_c (%)	1.75±1.95	0.23±0.30	2.59±3.61	0.96±0.73
	S_c (gr l ⁻¹)	0.08±0.04	0.12±0.10	0.31±0.20	0.59±0.71
S_l (gr m ⁻²)	0.07±0.08	0.02±0.03	0.37±0.73	0.19±0.39	

680 Table 4. Relevant parameters of the regression models performing the relation between I_{max} and R_r . I_{max}
 681 threshold is the I_{max} necessary to generate runoff. * denotes significance ($p < 0.05$).

Micro environment	Transition season			Wet season		
	I_{max} threshold	slope	R^2	I_{max} threshold	slope	R^2
NIS	4.88	0.254	0.93*	6.45	0.093	0.61*
NSC	1.86	0.083	0.77*	--	--	0.17
SIS	7.62	0.110	0.91	8.21	0.128	0.86*
SSC	3.74	0.027	0.85*	2.47	0.036	0.71*

682