

1 **Soil organic carbon along an altitudinal gradient in the**  
2 **Despeñaperros nature reserve, Southern Spain**

4 **L. Parras-Alcántara<sup>1</sup>, B. Lozano-García<sup>1</sup> and A. Galán-Espejo<sup>1</sup>**

5 [1]{Department of Agricultural Chemistry and Soil Science, Faculty of Science, Agrifood  
6 Campus of International Excellence - ceiA3, University of Cordoba, 14071 Cordoba, Spain}

7 Correspondence to: L. Parras-Alcántara (qe1paall@uco.es)

9 **Abstract**

10 Soil organic C (SOC) is extremely important in the global C cycle as C sequestration in non-  
11 disturbed soil ecosystems can be a C sink and mitigate greenhouse gas driven climate change.  
12 Soil organic C changes in space and time are relevant to understand the soil system and its  
13 role in the C cycle, and this is why the influence of topographic position on SOC should be  
14 studied. Seven topographic positions from a toposequence between 607 and 1168 m were  
15 analyzed in the Despeñaperros Natural Park (Jaén, SW Spain). Depending on soil depth, one  
16 to three control sections (0-25, 25-50 and 75-cm) were sampled at each site. The SOC content  
17 in studied soils is below 30 g kg<sup>-1</sup> and strongly decreases with depth. These results were  
18 related to the gravel content and to the bulk density. The SOC content from the topsoil (0-25  
19 cm) varied largely through the altitudinal gradient ranging between 27.3 and 39.9 g kg<sup>-1</sup>. The  
20 SOC stock (SOCS) varied between 53.8 and 158.0 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> in the studied area been clearly  
21 conditioned by the topographic position. Therefore, results suggest that elevation should be  
22 included in SOCS models and estimations at local and regional scales.

24 **1 Introduction**

25 Soils are an important C reservoir (Barua and Haque, 2013; Yan-Gui et al., 2013). In fact, the  
26 primary terrestrial pool of organic carbon (OC) is soil, which accounts for more than 71% of  
27 the Earth's terrestrial OC pool (Lal, 2010). In addition, soils have the ability to store C for a  
28 long time (over the last 5000 years) (Brevik and Homburg, 2004). Soils play a crucial role in  
29 the overall C cycle, and small changes in the soil organic carbon stock (SOCS) could

1 significantly affect atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) concentrations, and through that global  
2 climate change. Within the C cycle, soils can be a source of greenhouse gases through CO<sub>2</sub>  
3 and methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) emissions, or can be a sink for atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> through C sequestration  
4 in soil organic matter (OM) (Breuning-Madsen et al., 2009; Brevik, 2012).

5 Climate, soil use and soil management affect to soil OC variability, particularly in soils under  
6 Mediterranean type of climate, characterized by low OC content, weak structure and readily  
7 degradable soils (Hernanz et al., 2002). In temperate climates, recent studies show differences  
8 in C sequestration rates in soils depending on use and management (Muñoz-Rojas et al.,  
9 2012a and 2012b), climate and mineralogical composition (Wang et al., 2010), texture, slope  
10 and elevation (Hontoria et al., 2004), and tillage intensity and no-till duration (Umakant et al.,  
11 2010). Soil conservation strategies are being seen as a strategy to increase soil OM content  
12 (Barbera et al., 2012; Batjes et al., 2014; Jaiarree et al., 2014; Srinivasarao et al., 2014; Fialho  
13 and Zinn, 2014).

14 Several studies have been carried out to estimate differences in soil organic carbon (SOC)  
15 dynamics in relation to soil properties, land uses and climate (Eshetu et al., 2004; Lemenih  
16 and Itanna, 2004; Muñoz-Rojas et al., 2013). Although the impact of topographic position on  
17 soil properties on SOC content is widely recognized (Venterea et al., 2003; Fu et al., 2004;  
18 Brevik, 2013), relatively few studies have been conducted to examine the role of topographic  
19 position (Fernández-Romero et al., 2014; Lozano-García et al., 2014).

20 The spatial variation of soil properties may also be significantly influenced by aspect (which  
21 may induce microclimate variations), physiography, parent material, and vegetation (López-  
22 Vicente et al., 2009; Brevik, 2013; Ashley et al., 2014; Bakhshandeh et al., 2014; Dingil et al.,  
23 2014; Gebrelibanos et al., 2014; Kirkpatrick et al., 2014). Ovales & Collins (1986) evaluated  
24 soil variability due to pedogenic processes across landscapes in contrasting climatic  
25 environments and concluded that topographic position and variations in soil properties were  
26 significantly related. McKenzie and Austin (1993) and Gessler et al. (2000) found that  
27 variations of some soil properties could be related to the slope steepness, length, curvature  
28 and the relative location within a toposequence. Both studies suggest that the assessment of  
29 the hillslope sequence helps to understand variations of soil properties in order to establish  
30 relationships among specific topographic positions and soil properties. Asadi et al. (2012)  
31 found that the integrated effect of topography and land use determined soil properties.

1 Topography is a relevant factor controlling soil erosion processes through the redistribution of  
2 soil particles and soil OM (Cerdà and García Fayos, 1997; Ziada and Taimeh, 2013).

3 The topographic factor has been traditionally included in the study of the spatial distribution  
4 of soil properties (Fernández-Calviño et al., 2013; Haregeweyn et al., 2013; Ozgoz et al.,  
5 2013; Wang and Shao, 2013). Over time, many researchers have quantified the relationships  
6 between topographic parameters and soil properties such as soil OM and physical properties  
7 such as particle size distribution, bulk density and depth to specific horizon boundaries  
8 (McKenzie and Austin, 1993; Gessler et al., 1995; Gessler et al., 2000; Pachepsky et al.,  
9 2001; Ziada, 2005). Soil OM content has been negatively correlated with the topographic  
10 gradient (Ruhe and Walker, 1968), and slope gradient (Nizeyimana and Bicki, 1992).  
11 However, quantitative relationships between soil topography and soil physical-chemical  
12 properties are not well established for a wide range of environments (Hattar et al., 2010).

13 Research along altitudinal gradients has shed light on the effects of climate on soil properties.  
14 Ruiz-Sinoga et al. (2012) found a strong relationship between soil OM and elevation, which  
15 was due to reduced decomposition rates with lower temperatures. High erosion rates have  
16 been found under dry climates and low altitudes in Israel (Cerdà, 1998a; Cerdà, 1998b),  
17 which support the idea of high OM losses due to soil erosion in dry areas.

18 In this line, in Mediterranean natural areas there is no information about the soil variability,  
19 also little data is available related to the control topography exerts on soil properties (Lozano-  
20 García and Parras-Alcántara, 2014). Therefore, the aims of this study are: (i) to quantify SOC  
21 contents and their vertical distribution in a natural forest area, (ii) to assess the SOCS  
22 differences in soils along an altitudinal gradient and (iii) their relationship with soil depth in a  
23 Mediterranean natural area.

24

## 25 **2 Material and Methods**

### 26 **2.1 Study site**

27 The Despeñaperros Natural Park ( $76.8 \text{ km}^2$ ) is one of the best-preserved landscapes in  
28 southern Europe. It is located within the Eastern Sierra Morena (province of Jaén,  
29 southeastern Spain), at coordinates  $38^{\circ}20' - 38^{\circ}27' \text{N}$ ,  $3^{\circ}27' - 3^{\circ}37' \text{W}$ . The study area is  
30 characterized by warm dry summers and cool humid winters and climate is temperate semi-

1 arid with continental features due to elevation. Average extreme temperatures range between -  
2 10 °C (winter) and 42 °C (summer), with mean temperature 15 °C. The moisture regime is dry  
3 Mediterranean, with average annual rainfall is 800 mm. High temperatures and long drought  
4 periods cause water deficits up to 350 mm annually.

5 It is a mountainous area, with an altitudinal range of 540 m.a.s.l. in the Despeñaperros River  
6 valley to 1250 m.a.s.l at Malabriga Mountain. The relief is steep with slopes ranging from 3%  
7 to 45%, and the parent materials are primarily slates and quartzites. Most abundant soils in the  
8 area are Phaeozems (PH), Cambisols (CM), Regosols (RG) and Leptosols (LP), according to  
9 the classification by IUSS Working Group WRB (2006). Well-preserved Mediterranean  
10 woodlands and scrublands occupy the study area and large game habitat is the main land use.

11

## 12 **2.2 Soil sampling and analytical methods**

13 Seven sites were selected along a topographic gradient in a south-facing slope in the  
14 Despeñaperros Natural Park (Table 1). Soil samples were collected at each site following a  
15 random sampling design according to FAO (2006). Each selected point was sampled using  
16 soil control sections (SCS) at different depths (S1: 0-25, S2: 25-50 and S3: 50-75 cm). SCS  
17 were used for a uniform comparison between studied soils. Four replicates of each soil sample  
18 were analyzed in laboratory (17 sampling points × 1, 2 or 3 SCS × 4 replicates).

19 Soil samples were air-dried at constant room temperature (25 °C) and sieved (2 mm) to  
20 discard coarse particles. The analytical methods used in this study are described in Table 2.

21 Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS Inc. (2004). The physical and chemical soil  
22 properties were analyzed statistically for each SCS of different soil groups (PH, CM, RG and  
23 LP), including the average and standard deviation (SD). The statistical significance of the  
24 differences in each variable between each sampling point and soil type were tested using the  
25 Anderson-Darling test at each control section for each soil type. Differences with  $p < 0.05$  were  
26 considered statistically significant.

27

1    **3 Results and discussion**

2    **3.1 Soil properties**

3    The studied soils were classified as Phaeozems, Cambisols, Regosols and Leptosols (IUSS  
4    Working Group WRB, 2006) (Table 1). The soils are stony soils, acidic, with low base  
5    concentrations, oligotrophic and with slightly unsaturated complex change and located in  
6    areas of variable slopes ranging between 5% and 38%. Phaeozems are the most developed  
7    soils in the study area. They are deep, dark, and well humidified with high biological activity  
8    and high vegetation density on gentle slopes and shady side foothills. Cambisols are  
9    developed and deep soils; however, Leptosols are the least developed and shallowest soils.

10   Phaeozems are the most pedogenically developed soils in the study area. They are found on  
11   gentle slopes (<3%), usually in shaded areas on Ordovician sandstones. The gravel content is  
12   variable, ranging between 7% and 31% (weight). Texturally they are sandy soils at the surface  
13   and silty-clay-loam or silty-clay soils at depth, with a horizons sequence A0/A1/AB/Bt/C1.  
14   These soils show luvic (lv) characteristics (luvic-Phaeozems (lv-PH)) and are >1 m in depth  
15   with pH along the profile ranging from 6.3 to 5.6 at depth and about 4.3% OM content (Table  
16   1 and 3).

17   Cambisols are less developed soils than luvic-Phaeozems, however, these soils are more  
18   developed and deeper than Regosols and Leptosols. They appear in areas of variable slope (3-  
19   38%) and are >1 m in depth characterized by a cambic horizon (Bw) on Ordovician quartzites  
20   (Table 1) with approximately 20% gravel content. At the surface they are sandy soils (<60%  
21   sand content) with high clay content in the Bw horizon and increasing clay content with depth  
22   (Table 3). The horizon sequences were A0/A1/AB/BW/BC/C1 or A0/A1/AB/BW. These soils  
23   are characterized by low OM content at depth. Gallardo et al. (2000) showed that the low OM  
24   content could be explained by the semiarid Mediterranean conditions. In addition, Parras-  
25   Alcántara et al. (2013a) found there is less OM and fewer mineral aggregates in sandy soils,  
26   thus favoring high levels of OM transformation. Because of this, Hontoria et al. (2004)  
27   suggested that physical variables determine soil development in the driest areas of Spain to a  
28   greater degree than management or climatic variables. The Cambisols topsoil has humic (hu)  
29   characteristics, with >5% OM content (Table 3) due to plant debris accumulation in the A0  
30   horizon. This OM is poorly structured and partially decomposed, thereby reducing the amount  
31   and increasing the OM evolution degree with depth. In this line, Bech et al. (1983) reported

1 that the free OM concentration in the surface horizon was higher than 90%, while humic and  
2 fulvic acid concentrations were less than 2% in soils with *Quercus ilex* spp. ballota  
3 vegetation. Free OM was reduced and humidification increased up to 30% in deeper layers.

4 Regosols can be found in steeply sloping areas (>8%) characterized by high water erosion and  
5 subject to rejuvenation processes. We found eutric (eu), dystric (dy) and umbric (um)  
6 Regosols (Table 1) on sandstone and quartzite parent materials with >25% gravel content in  
7 surface layers that eventually disappeared in depth in some cases. These soils are sandy-  
8 loamy in surface layers and silty-clay in deep layers, with different horizon sequences  
9 (A0/A1/AB/BC/C1, A0/A1/AC/C1 and A1/AC/C1). Eutric-Regosols are deeper soils (>80  
10 cm) that are loamy with high gravel content (25.1-32.2%) at the surface decreasing with deep,  
11 acid pH (5.9) and high OM content (6.7%) at the surface. The dystric-Regosols are stony soils  
12 that are shallow (<40 cm), loamy at the surface and sandy at depth with high gravel content  
13 (>40%) at the surface, acid pH (6.2) and high OM content (7.3%) in the surface horizon  
14 (Table 3). The umbric-Regosols are also stony, they are deep soils (>70 cm) that are loamy  
15 with high gravel content (40%) in the surface decreasing to 11% at depth, acid pH (5.6) and  
16 high OM content (6.5%) (Table 3).

17 Leptosols are the least developed soils of the study area. Lithic (li), mollic (mo) and eutric  
18 (eu) Leptosols were identified (Table 1) formed in sandstones, quartzites and slates on  
19 variable slopes (1.5-46%). Horizon sequences A1/AC/C1, A1/AC, and AC/C1 and A1 were  
20 found. The gravel content was variable (>40% in the topographically elevated areas and  
21 decreasing with depth) with high sand content (>50%) in the surface layers. One characteristic  
22 of these soils is that the clay content increased with depth, reaching up to 30%. According to  
23 Recio et al. (1986), the physical-chemical properties of the soils in the study area are due to  
24 lithology, while their low edaphic development is conditioned by age. According to Nerger et  
25 al. (2007), the alteration and pedogenesis processes taking place in these soils usually occur  
26 on low slopes. The lithic-Leptosols are the least developed soils at this study site, with  
27 thicknesses ranging between 10 and 15 cm in areas of steep slope. In flat areas, their low  
28 development is due to their extreme youth. These soils are loamy with a high gravel content  
29 (>28%), acid pH and >4% OM content. Mollic-Leptosols are characterized by mollic surface  
30 horizons (thick, well-structured, dark, high base saturation and high OM content), on variable  
31 slopes (18.5%-38.5%). According to Corral-Fernández et al. (2013) these soils are  
32 characterized by organic residue accumulation in the surface horizons; this OM is poorly

1 structured and partially decomposed at the surface with increasing decomposition rate with  
2 depth. Umbric-Leptosols are characterized by high OM content, are shallow, and either loamy  
3 with high stony content (>20% gravel content) or sandy (>55% sand content), have low bulk  
4 density conditioned by the OM content, high porosity and acid pH (Table 3).

5

### 6 **3.2 Distribution of soil organic carbon**

7 Generally, soils in the study area are characterized by >3% OC content, making them part of  
8 the 45% of the mineral soils of Europe that have between 2 and 6% OC content (Rusco et al.,  
9 2001). Soil OM content decreased with depth at all topographic positions (A, B, C and D  
10 positions) (Table 4). However, this property cannot be observed in the lowest topographic  
11 positions (E, F and G positions) due to the low edaphic development (umbric-Leptosols,  
12 lithic-Leptosols and mollic-Leptosols) as only one SCS exists (S1: 0-25 cm) (Tables 1 and 4).

13 The soils in this study are characterized by high sand content at the surface (S1) varying  
14 between 59.2 and 34.2% for C and F positions respectively, and reduced sand content with  
15 depth in all studied soils (Table 3), affecting to OM development. With respect to clay content  
16 reaches 45% in C: S3. In addition, the mineral medium may play an important role in soil  
17 humidification processes, so we can explain low soil OM concentrations with depth due in  
18 part to soil texture, because soil OM tends to decrease with depth in virtually all soils,  
19 regardless of textural changes. Clays over sands would have a decrease in soil OM with depth  
20 also, and probably a more marked decrease. In addition, the formation of aggregates made up  
21 of OM and the mineral fraction is reduced, thus favoring high OM levels in sandy soils at  
22 depth (González and Candás, 2004). Furthermore, Gallardo et al. (2000) argued that the  
23 relatively low concentrations of OM in depth could be explained by the climate  
24 (Mediterranean semiarid). Similar results have been found by Corral-Fernández et al. (2013),  
25 Parras-Alcántara et al. (2014) and Lozano-García and Parras-Alcántara (2013a) in the  
26 Pedroches Valley, near the study area.

27 Another key issue is that the clay fraction increased with depth in the B and C positions  
28 (reaching a clay content of as high as 45% (C: S3)) and its relation with soil OM at depth (S2:  
29 25-50 cm), which was characterized by high OM contents as compared to S3 (B:2.0/0.6%;  
30 C:1.8/0.06%) (Table 4). Burke et al. (1989) and Leifeld et al. (2005) have shown high OM  
31 levels in soils with high clay content in depth indicating clay stabilization mechanisms in the

1 soil. This effect can be observed in the B and C topographic positions, where an increase in  
2 clay content was observed at depth as compared to the upper horizons (B:S1-17.2%/S2-  
3 22.1%; C:S1-16.1%/S2-35.7%). This OM increase may be due to carbon translocation  
4 mechanisms (dissolved organic carbon), soil biological activity and/or the root depth effect  
5 (Shertha et al., 2004).

6 Soil OM appears to be concentrated in the first 25 cm (S1) due to OM, where the  
7 mineralization and immobilization C processes should be slightly active. In the surface layer  
8 (S1), OM was variable along the toposequence studied ranging between 39.9 and 27.3 g kg<sup>-1</sup>  
9 at the B and F positions, respectively (Table 4). In this regard, it is important to point out that  
10 the S1 layer can reach over 60% of the total soil organic carbon (T-SOC) values documented,  
11 corresponding to 60, 64.4 and 63% for the B, C and D positions respectively as compared to  
12 the rest of the soil profile (S2 or S2+S3). Batjes (1996) states that for the 0 to 100 cm depth  
13 approximately 50% of soil organic carbon (SOC) appears in the first 30 cm of the soil.  
14 Jobbágy and Jackson (2000) showed that 50% of SOC is concentrated in the first 20 cm in  
15 forest soils to 1-m depth. Civeira et al. (2012), showed that SOC in the upper 30 cm of soils in  
16 Argentina is much higher than in the 30-100 cm interval. Data provided by these authors and  
17 the results obtained in this study may be comparable because in this study we used a 75 cm  
18 depth and the mentioned authors used a 1m depth. Furthermore, Jobbágy and Jackson (2000)  
19 indicated that changes in SOC were conditioned by vegetation type (which determines the  
20 vertical distribution of roots) and to a lesser extent the effect of climate and clay content.  
21 Despite this, climatic conditions can be a determining factor in the SOC concentrations for  
22 surface horizons, whereas clay content may be the most important element in deeper horizons,  
23 also, clay contributes to stabilize OM by protecting physically of microbial activity and  
24 reducing C outputs, this effect is important under homogeneous climate conditions (as those  
25 in the study area). At the regional-global scale, the precipitation contributes to maximize SOC  
26 and temperature accelerates mineralization process decreasing the SOC (Post et al., 1982).

27 Results of T-SOC analysis in the studied area did not show great along the toposequence. T-  
28 SOC depended on the degree of development of the soil that appeared at each topographical  
29 position. The T-SOC was highest at the B (66.5 g kg<sup>-1</sup>), D (58.1 g kg<sup>-1</sup>) and C (52.3 g kg<sup>-1</sup>)  
30 positions, corresponding to Cambisols-Regosols-Leptosols, Regosols, and Phaeozems-  
31 Cambisols-Regosols respectively. Leptosols showed the lowest T-SOC content with 27.3 g  
32 kg<sup>-1</sup>, 31.9 g kg<sup>-1</sup>, 32.7 g kg<sup>-1</sup> and 38.1 g kg<sup>-1</sup> at the F, G, E and A topographic positions,

1 respectively. Similarly, >60% of SOC concentrated in the S1 layer of deeper soils (B, C and  
2 D).

3 Precipitation and temperature varied through the studied toposequence, where precipitation  
4 increases and temperature decreasing with increasing elevation. T-SOC content was not  
5 affected by climatic variations, but depended on the soil development in each landscape  
6 position. Reduced T-SOC contents were observed at the lowest topographic positions, where  
7 soils were shallower. This is in agreement with Power and Schlesinger (2002) who concluded  
8 that topographic position affects T-SOC, due to low OM decomposition rates under low  
9 temperatures.

10

### 11 **3.3 Soil organic carbon stocks**

12 SOCS in the study area showed a reduction with depth in all topographic positions (Table 4).  
13 This SOCS reduction along the profile is linked to OM reduction with depth, this reduction in  
14 SOCS also depended on the gravel content and the bulk density (Table 3).

15 When the upper SCS was analyzed we observed high SOCS values as high as  $91.1 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$  in  
16 the elevated topographic positions (highest value at the B position). The lowest SOCS values  
17 were found at the G position ( $53.8 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$ ), the lowest site in the toposequence. This trend of  
18 decreasing SOCS with decreasing elevation is constant except at the A and E positions. Both  
19 are poorly developed soils with high OM content in the surface horizon).

20 We observed that at the D and B topographic positions between 53.8 and 58.0% of SOCS,  
21 respectively, occurred in the S1 SCS. This constituted 63.0% and 60.0% of T-SOC in these  
22 topographic positions. This shows that the gravel content and bulk density affects the SOCS  
23 in the surface horizons of the toposequence studied, and, therefore, SOCS decreases when  
24 SOC increases. In the most developed soil, similar SOC and SOCS concentrations (B: 60%-  
25 SOC; 58%-SOCS) were observed in the S1 layer, conditioned by bulk density and gravel  
26 content. In addition, SOCS decreased in depth conditioned by reduction of gravel content and  
27 increasing bulk density. This is not in agreement with Tsui et al. (2013) and Minasny et al.  
28 (2006), who suggested a negative relation between bulk density and depth as a consequence  
29 of high OM content at the surface, linked to low clay concentrations (Li et al., 2010). In this  
30 sense, we observed that high SOCS depended on the SOC concentration and the clay content.

1 However, the SOC concentration affected the SOCS to a lesser degree so that in S2 (25-50  
2 cm) we found >10% of SOCS related to SOC (C position).

3 In contrast, low SOCS can be found in S3 except at the B topographic position ( $19.1 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$ ).  
4 This situation could be due to the fact that pedological horizons were generally different than  
5 the SCS divisions (S1: 0-25 cm; S2: 25-50 and S3: 50-75 cm) (Hiederer, 2009); in other  
6 words, the SCS divisions often led to the mixing of two or more soil horizons (depending on  
7 thickness horizon) in any given SCS division.

8 In all studied soils, the clay content increased with depth. This clay content increase is  
9 associated to higher values of SOC (B: S2 and C: S2). In this line, we can explain high SOCS  
10 concentrations in clayey soils caused by clay stabilization mechanisms on SOC, this effect  
11 can be observed at the A topographic position which has higher clay content with respect to the  
12 B and D positions. However, a SOCS increase can be observed. This is the case at the D and  
13 C topographical positions with SOCS values of  $52.1$  and  $50.1 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$  respectively in the S2  
14 sampling layer (Table 4), showing a correlation between S1 and S2, due to carbon  
15 translocation processes as dissolved organic carbon, bioturbation and/or deep rooting  
16 (Sherstha et al., 2004).

### 17 **3.4 Soil organic carbon stocks along the altitudinal gradient**

18 The SOCS results along the toposequence were also studied. It is important to point out that  
19 total SOCS (T-SOCS) were influenced by topographical position in the toposequence  
20 analyzed. T-SOCS increased linearly with elevation from G (607 m.a.s.l.) to B site (1009  
21 m.a.s.l.), with the exception of the highest topographic position, A (1168 m.a.s.l.), with a  
22 linear regression relationship (Figure 1). Similar results were found by Ganuza and  
23 Almendros (2003), Leifeld et al. (2005) and Fernández-Romero et al. (2014). These studies  
24 showed that the T-SOCS increased with elevation. However, Avilés-Hernández et al. (2009)  
25 found that T-SOCS from forest soils decreased with elevation in a toposequence in Mexico  
26 due to variations in the OM decomposition rate and Lozano-García and Parras-Alcántara  
27 (2014) found that T-SOCS decreased with elevation in a traditional Mediterranean olive grove  
28 due to erosion. With respect to the A position in this study, the lower T-SOCS ( $72.9 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$ )  
29 values with respect to the rest of the studied toposequence may be due to soil loss caused by  
30 erosion processes in soils with a low level of development. Similar results have been found by  
31 Parras-Alcántara et al. (2004) and Durán-Zuazo et al. (2013). Parras-Alcántara et al. (2004)

1 explained their findings as a consequence of high soil erosion rates, caused by high erosivity  
2 of rainfall, high erosionability, steep slopes, low vegetation cover and the lack of conservation  
3 practices in the studied area. Durán-Zuazo et al. (2013) explained this effect by low  
4 vegetation densities in the upper parts of mountain areas that can cause high erosion with  
5 strong water runoff. Martínez-Mena et al. (2008) have emphasized the effects of erosion on  
6 soil OM loss, especially under semi-arid conditions. In this context, a low vegetation ratio can  
7 accelerate OM decomposition, weakening soil aggregates (Balesdent et al., 2000; Paustian et  
8 al., 2000). Cerdà (2000) indicated that this effect could occur regardless of climatic  
9 conditions.

10 As can be seen in Table 4, T-SOCS decrease was not homogeneous. In some cases, rapid  
11 changes were found, while in other situations gradual changes were noted. Abrupt changes in  
12 T-SOCS occurred between the B/C and D/E topographic positions, showing T-SOCS  
13 differences of 38 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 44 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> respectively. Gradual changes in T-SOCS occurred  
14 between the C/D, E/F and F/G topographic positions with variations of 3 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>, 13 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>  
15 and 6 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> respectively. Many authors have concluded that the SOCS reduction can be  
16 explained by soil physical properties - mainly texture (Corral-Fernández et al., 2013; Parras-  
17 Alcántara et al., 2013b). The studied soils are sandy at the surface, with clay increasing with  
18 depth, except in E, F and G sites (soils that have S2 and/or S3 SCS), therefore, OM stabilizing  
19 mechanisms are produced, reducing the aggregate formation between SOC and mineral  
20 fraction at depth. As a result, the SOCS content is lower with sandy soils (Nieto et al., 2013).  
21 González and Candás (2004) and Parras-Alcántara et al. (2013a) obtained similar results, the  
22 first in sandy-loamy soils and the second in Mediterranean clayey soils. In addition, low SOC  
23 levels are conditioned by the climatic characteristics of southern Europe (Gallardo et al.,  
24 2000).

25

## 26 **Conclusions**

27 Soils found in the Despeñaperros nature reserve include Phaeozems, Cambisols, Regosols and  
28 Leptosols. Phaeozems are the deepest and most developed soils, and Leptosols are the least  
29 developed and shallowest soils. These soils are characterized by low OM content with depth  
30 due to the semiarid Mediterranean conditions and the high sand content. The studied soils are  
31 characterized by organic residue accumulation in the surface horizons.

1 The SOC content decreased with depth at all topographic positions and the clay fraction  
2 increased with depth. The mineral medium played an important role in soil humidification  
3 processes. In addition, the SOC in the S2 layers is characterized by high SOC values with  
4 respect to the S3 layers indicating clay stabilization mechanisms in the soil. We can explain  
5 this increase due to carbon translocation mechanisms (dissolved organic carbon), soil  
6 biological activity and/or the root depth effect.

7 With respect to T-SOC content, there is not a large difference between T-SOC along the  
8 toposequence. The T-SOC of these soils depends on the degree of development of the soils  
9 found at each topographic position. We can observe a T-SOC reduction at the lowest  
10 topographic positions for less developed soils and a T-SOC increase at the highest  
11 topographic positions in the more developed soils. SOCS in the study zone show a reduction  
12 with depth in all topographic positions. This SOCS reduction along the profile is linked to  
13 OM and gravel content reduction and an increase in bulk density with depth. The T-SOCS  
14 increased with altitude, due to the higher turnover of organic material (plants) and the lower  
15 decomposition rate due to lower temperatures.

16

## 17 **Acknowledgements**

18 We thank Eric C. Brevik for his contribution to improve this paper.

19

## 20 **References**

21 Asadi, H., Raeisvandi, A., Rabiei, B., and Ghadiri, H.: Effect of land use and topography on  
22 soil properties and agronomic productivity on calcareous soils of a semiarid region, Iran.  
23 Land Degrad. Develop. 23, 496-504, 2012.

24 Ashley, G.M., Beverly, E.J., Sikes, N.E., Driese, S.G.: Paleosol diversity in the Olduvai  
25 Basin, Tanzania: Effects of geomorphology, parent material, depositional environment, and  
26 groundwater on soil development. Quaternary International 322-323, 66-77, 2014.

27 Avilés-Hernández, V., Velázquez-Martínez, A., Ángeles-Pérez, G., Etchevers-Barra, J., De  
28 los Santos-Posadas, H., and Llandera, T.: Variación en almacenes de carbono en suelos de  
29 una toposecuencia. Agrociencia 43, 457-464, 2009.

1 Balesdent, J., Chenu, C., and Balabane, M.: Relationship of soil organic matter dynamics to  
2 physical protection and tillage. *Soil Till. Res.* 53, 215-230, 2000.

3 Bakhshandeh, S., Norouzi, M., Heidari, S., Bakhshandeh, S.: The role of parent material on  
4 soil properties in sloping areas under tea plantation in Lahijan, Iran. *Carpathian Journal of*  
5 *Earth and Environmental Sciences* 9, 159-170, 2014.

6 Barbera, V., Poma, I., Gristina, L., Novara, A., and Egli, M.: Long-term cropping systems and  
7 tillage management effects on soil organic carbon stock and steady state level of C  
8 sequestration rates in a semiarid environment. *Land Degrad. Develop.* 23, 82-91, 2012.

9 Barua, A.K., and Haque, S.M.S.: Soil characteristics and carbon sequestration potentials of  
10 vegetation in degraded hills of Chittagong, Bangladesh. *Land Degrad. Develop.* 24, 63-71,  
11 2013.

12 Batjes, N.H.: Total carbon and nitrogen in the soils of the world. *Eur. J. Soil Sci.* 47(2), 151-  
13 163, 1996.

14 Batjes, NH.: Projected changes in soil organic carbon stocks upon adoption of recommended  
15 soil and water conservation practices in the Upper Tana River Catchment, Kenia. *Land*  
16 *Degrad. Develop.* 25, 278-287, 2014.

17 Bech, J., Hereter, A., and Vallejo, R.: Las tierras pardo ácidas sobre granodioritas de la zona  
18 nor-oriental del macizo del Montseny. *An. Edaf. Agrob.* 42, 371-393, 1983.

19 Blake, G.R., and Hartge, K.H.: Bulk density, in: Klute, A., (Eds), *Methods of soil analysis*.  
20 Part I. Physical and mineralogical methods. *Agronomy Monography* nº 9. ASA, SSSA.  
21 Madison WI, USA, pp. 363-375, 1986.

22 Breuning-Madsen, H., Elberling, B., Balstroem, T., Holst, M., and Freudenberg, M.: A  
23 comparison of soil organic carbon stock in ancient and modern land use systems in Denmark.  
24 *Eur. J. Soil Sci.* 60, 55-63, 2009.

25 Brevik, E.C.: Soils and climate change: Gas fluxes and soil processes. *Soil Horiz.* 53(4), 12-  
26 23, 2012.

27 Brevik, E.C., and Homburg, J.: A 5000 year record of carbon sequestration from a coastal  
28 lagoon and wetland complex, Southern California, USA. *Catena*, 57(3), 221-232, 2004.

29 Brevik, E.C.: Forty years of soil formation in a South Georgia, USA borrow pit. *Soil Horiz.*  
30 54(1), 20-29, 2013. doi:10.2136/sh12-08-0025.

1 Burke, I., Yonker, C., Parton, W., Cole, C., Flach, K., and Schimel, D.: Texture, climate, and  
2 cultivation effects on soil organic matter content in U.S. grassland soils. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*  
3 53, 800-805, 1989.

4 Cerdà, A.: Effect of climate on surface flow along a climatological gradient in Israel. A field  
5 rainfall simulation approach. *J. Arid Environ.* 38, 145-159. 1998a

6 Cerdà, A.: Relationship between climate and soil hydrological and erosional characteristics  
7 along climatic gradients in Mediterranean limestone areas. *Geomorphology*, 25, 123-134,  
8 1998b.

9 Cerdà, A.: Aggregate stability against water forces under different climates on agriculture  
10 land and scrubland in southern Bolivia. *Soil Till. Res.* 57, 159-166, 2000.

11 Cerdà, A., and García-Fayos, P.: The influence of slope angle on sediment, water and seed  
12 losses on badland landscapes. *Geomorphology*, 18, 77-90, 1997.

13 Civeira, G., Irigoin, J., and Paladino, I.R.: Soil organic carbon in Pampean agroecosystems:  
14 Horizontal and vertical distribution determined by soil great group. *Soil Horiz.* 53(5), 43-49,  
15 2012.

16 Corral-Fernández, R., Parras-Alcántara, L., and Lozano-García, B.: Stratification ratio of soil  
17 organic C, N and C:N in Mediterranean evergreen oak woodland with conventional and  
18 organic tillage. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 164, 252-259, 2013.

19 Dingil, M., Öztekin, M.E., Şenol, S.: Definition of the physiographic units and land use  
20 capability classes of soils in mountainous areas via satellite imaging. *Fresenius Environmental*  
21 *Bulletin* 23 (3A), 952-955, 2014

22 Duchaufour, P.H.: *Manual de Edafología*. Editorial Toray-Masson. Barcelona, 1975.

23 Durán-Zuazo, V.H., Francia-Martínez, J.R., García-Tejero, I., and Cuadros-Tavira, S.:  
24 Implications of land-cover types for soil erosion on semiarid mountain slopes: Towards  
25 sustainable land use in problematic landscapes. *Acta Ecol. Sinica*, 33, 272-281, 2013.

26 Eshetu, Z., Giesler, R., and Höglberg, P.: Historical land use affects the chemistry of forest  
27 soils in the Ethiopian highlands. *Geoderma*, 118, 149-165, 2004.

28 FAO: Guidelines for soil description. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United  
29 Nations, Rome, Italy, 2006.

1 Fernández-Calviño, D., Garrido-Rodríguez, B., López-Periago, J.E., Paradelo, M., and Arias-  
2 Estévez, M.: Spatial distribution of copper fractions in a vineyard soil. *Land Degrad. Develop.*  
3 24, 556-563, 2013.

4 Fernández-Romero, M.L., Parras-Alcántara, L., and Lozano-García, B.: Land use change  
5 from forest to olive grove soils in a toposequence in Mediterranean areas (South of Spain).  
6 *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 195, 1-9, 2014.

7 Fialho R.C., and Zinn Y.L.: Changes in soil organic carbon under Eucaliptus plantations in  
8 Brazil: a comparative analysis. *Land Degrad. Develop.* 2014 (in press), DOI:  
9 10.1002/ldr.2158.

10 Fu, B.J., Liu, S.L., Ma, K.M., and Zhu, Y.G.: Relationships between soil characteristics,  
11 topography and plant diversity in a heterogeneous deciduous broad-leaved forest near Beijing,  
12 China. *Plant Soil* 261, 47-54, 2004.

13 Gallardo, A., Rodríguez-Saucedo, J., Covelo, F., and Fernández-Ales, R.: Soil nitrogen  
14 heterogeneity in dehesa ecosystem. *Plant Soil* 222, 71-82, 2000.

15 Ganuza, A., and Almendros, G.: Organic carbon storage of the Basques Country (Spain): the  
16 effect of climate, vegetation type and edaphic variables. *Biol. Fert. Soils* 37, 154-162, 2003.

17 Gebrelibanos, T., Assen, M.: Effects of slope aspect and vegetation types on selected soil  
18 properties in a dryland Hirmi watershed and adjacent agro-ecosystem, northern highlands of  
19 Ethiopia. *African Journal of Ecology*, 52, 292-299, 2014.

20 Gessler, P.E., Moore, I.D., McKenzie, N.J., and Ryan, P.J.: Soil-landscape modeling and  
21 spatial prediction of soil attributes. Special issue: integrating GIS and environmental  
22 modeling. *Int. J. GIS* 9(4), 421-432, 1995.

23 Gessler, P.E., Chadwick, O.A., Chamran, F., Althouse, and L., Holmes, K.: Modeling soil-  
24 landscape and ecosystem properties using terrain attributes. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 64, 2046-  
25 2056, 2000.

26 González, J. and Candás, M.: Materia orgánica de suelos bajo encinas: mineralización de  
27 carbono y nitrógeno, *Invest. Agrar.*, 75-83, 2004.

28 Haregeweyn, N., Poesen, J., Verstraeten, G., Govers, G., De Vente, J., Nyssen, J., Deckers, J.,  
29 and Moeyersons, J.: Assessing the performance of a spatially distributed soil erosion and

1 sediment delivery model (WATEM/SEDEM in Northern Ethiopia. Land Degrad. Develop.  
2 24, 188- 204, 2013.

3 Hattar, B.I., Taimeh, A.Y., and Ziada, F.M.: Variation in soil chemical properties along  
4 toposequences in an arid region of the Levant. *Catena*, 83, 34-45, 2010.

5 Hernanz, J.T., López, R., Navarrete, T., and Sánchez-Girón, V.: Long-term effects of tillage  
6 systems and rotations on soil structural stability and organic carbon stratification in semiarid  
7 central Spain. *Soil Till. Res.* 66, 129-141, 2002.

8 Hiederer, R.: Distribution of Organic Carbon in Soil Profile Data. EUR 23980 EN.  
9 Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities 126 pp, 2009.

10 Hontoria, C., Rodríguez-Murillo, J.C., and Saa, A.: Contenido de carbono orgánico en el  
11 suelo y factores de control en la España peninsular. *Edafología* 11, 149-157, 2004.

12 IPCC, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.: Good practice guidance for land use,  
13 land use change and forestry. In: Penman, J., Gytarsky, M., Hiraishi, T., Krug, T., Kruger, D.,  
14 Pipatti, R., Buendia, L., Miwa, K., Ngara, T., Tanabe, K., Wagner, F., (Eds),  
15 IPCC/OECD/IEA/IGES, Hayama, Japan, 2003.

16 IUSS Working Group WRB: World reference base for soil resources 2006, World Soil  
17 Resources Reports2nd edition, No. 103. FAO, Rome, Italy, 2006.

18 Jaiarree, S., Chidthaisong, A., Tangtham, N., Polprasert, C., Sarobol, E., and Tyler S.C.:  
19 Carbon Budget and sequestration potential in a sandy soil treated with compost. *Land Degrad.*  
20 *Develop.* 25, 120-129, 2014.

21 Jobbágy, E.G., and Jackson, R.B.: The Vertical Distribution of Soil Organic Carbon and Its  
22 Relation to Climate and Vegetation. *Ecol. Appl.* 10(2), 423-436, 2000.

23 Kirkpatrick, J.B., Green, K., Bridle, K.L., Venn, S.E.: Patterns of variation in Australian  
24 alpine soils and their relationships to parent material, vegetation formation, climate and  
25 topography. *Catena* 121, 186-194, 2014.

26 Lal, R.: Managing soils and ecosystems for mitigating anthropogenic carbon emissions and  
27 advancing global food security. *Bioscience* 60, 708-721, 2010.

28 Leifeld, J., Bassin, S., and Fuhrer, J.: Carbon stocks in Swiss agricultural soils predicted by  
29 land use: soil characteristics and altitude. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 105, 255-266, 2005.

1 Lemenih, M., and Itanna, F.: Soil carbon stock and turnovers in various vegetation types and  
2 arable lands along an elevation gradient in southern Ethiopia. *Geoderma* 123, 177-188, 2004.

3 Li, P., Wang, Q., Endo, T., Chao, X., and Kakubari, Y.: Soil organic carbon stock is closely  
4 related to aboveground vegetation properties in cold-temperature mountainous forests.  
5 *Geoderma* 154, 407-415, 2010.

6 López-Vicente, M., Navas, A., Machín, J.: Effect of physiographic conditions on the spatial  
7 variation of seasonal topsoil moisture in Mediterranean soils. *Australian Journal of Soil  
8 Research* 47, 498-507, 2009.

9 Lozano-García, B., and Parras-Alcántara, L.: Land use and management effects on carbon and  
10 nitrogen in Mediterranean Cambisols. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 179, 208-214, 2013.

11 Lozano-García, B., and Parras-Alcántara, L.: Variation in soil organic carbon and nitrogen  
12 stocks along a toposequence in a traditional Mediterranean olive grove. *Land Degrad.  
13 Develop.* 25, 297-304, 2014.

14 Martínez-Mena, M., López, J., Almagro, M., Boix-Fayos, C., and Albadalejo, K.: Effects of  
15 water erosion and cultivation on the soil carbon stock in a semiarid area of South-East Spain.  
16 *Soil Till. Res.* 99, 119-129, 2008.

17 McKenzie, N.J., and Austin, M.P.: A quantitative Australian approach to medium and small  
18 scale surveys based on soil stratigraphy and environmental correlation. *Geoderma* 57, 329-  
19 355, 1993.

20 Minasny, B., McBratney, A.B., Mendonça-Santos, M.L., Odeh, I.O.A., and Guyon, B.:  
21 Prediction and digital mapping of soil carbon storage in the Lower Namoi Valley. *Aust. J.  
22 Soil Res.* 44, 233-244, 2006.

23 Muñoz-Rojas, M., Jordán, A., Zavala, L.M., De la Rosa, D., Abd-Elmabod, S.K., and Anaya-  
24 Romero, M.: Impact of land use and land cover changes on organic C stocks in Mediterranean  
25 soils (1956-2007). *Land Degrad. Develop.* 2012a. DOI: 10.1002/ldr.2194.

26 Muñoz-Rojas, M., Jordán, A., Zavala, L.M., De la Rosa, D., Abd-Elmabod, S.K., and Anaya-  
27 Romero, M.: Organic carbon stocks in Mediterranean soil types under different land uses  
28 (Southern Spain). *Solid Earth* 3, 375-386, 2012b.

1 Muñoz-Rojas, M., Jordán, A., Zavala, L.M., González-Peñaloza, F.A., De la Rosa, D., Anaya-  
2 Romero, M.: Modelling soil organic carbon stocks in global change scenarios: a CarboSOIL  
3 application. *Biogeosciences* 10, 8253-8268, 2013.

4 Nelson, D.W., and Sommers, L.E.: Total carbon, organic carbon and organic matter. In: Page,  
5 A.L., Miller, R.H., Keeney, D. (Eds.), *Methods of soil analysis, Part 2. Chemical and*  
6 *microbiological properties*. In: *Agronomy monograph, vol. 9*. ASA and SSSA, Madison WI,  
7 539-579, 1982.

8 Nerger, R., Núñez, M.A., and Recio, J.M.: Presencia de carbonatos en suelos desarrollados  
9 sobre material granítico del Batolito de los Pedroches (Córdoba). In: Jordán, A., Bellifante, N.  
10 (Eds.), *Tendencias Actuales de la Ciencia del Suelo*. Universidad de Sevilla, 768-774, 2007.

11 Nieto, O.M., Castro, J., and Fernández-Ondoño, E.: Conventional tillage versus cover crops in  
12 relation to carbón fixation in Mediterranean olive cultivation. *Plant Soil*, 365, 321-335, 2013.

13 Nizeyimana, E., and Bicki, T.J.: Soil and soil-landscape relationships in the north central  
14 region of Rwanda, East-central Africa. *Soil Sci.* 153, 224-236, 1992.

15 Ozgoz, E., Gunal, H., Acir, N., Gokmen, F., Birol, M., and Budak, M.: Soil quality and spatial  
16 variability assessment of effects in a typic Haplustall. *Land Degrad. Develop.* 24, 277-286,  
17 2013.

18 Ovales, F.A., and Collins, M.E.: Soil-landscape relationships and soil variability in North  
19 Central Florida. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 50, 401-408, 1986.

20 Pachepsky, Y.A., Timlin, D.J., and Rawls, W.J.: Soil water retention as related to topographic  
21 variables. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 65, 1787-1795, 2001.

22 Parras-Alcántara, L., Corral, L., and Gil, J.: Ordenación territorial del Parque Natural de  
23 Despeñaperros (Jaén): Criterios metodológicos. Ed. Instituto de Estudios Giennenses, Jaén,  
24 2004.

25 Parras-Alcántara, L., Martín-Carrillo, M., and Lozano-García, B.: Impacts of land use change  
26 in soil carbon and nitrogen in a Mediterranean agricultural area (Southern Spain). *Solid Earth*  
27 4, 167-177, 2013a.

28 Parras-Alcántara, L., Díaz-Jaimes, L., and Lozano-García, B.: Organic farming affects c and n  
29 in soils under olive groves in mediterranean areas. *Land Degrad. Develop.* DOI:  
30 10.1002/ldr.2231 (in press), 2013b.

1 Parras-Alcántara, L., Díaz-Jaimes, L., Lozano-García, B., Fernández, P., Moreno, F., and  
2 Carbonero, M.: Organic farming has little effect on carbon stock in a Mediterranean dehesa  
3 (southern Spain). *Catena* 113, 9-17, 2014.

4 Paustian, K., Six, J., Elliot, E.T., and Hunt, H.Q.: Management options for reducing CO<sub>2</sub>  
5 emissions from agricultural soils. *Biogeochemistry* 48, 147-163, 2000.

6 Post, W.M., Emanuel W.R., Zinke P.J., and Stangenberger, A.J.: Soil carbon pools and world  
7 life zones. *Nature* 298, 156-159, 1982.

8 Power, J., and Schlesinger, W.H.: Relationships among soil carbon distribution and  
9 biophysical factors at nested spatial scales in rain forest of northeastern Costa Rica. *Geoderma*  
10 109, 165-190, 2002.

11 Recio, J.M., Corral, L., and Paneque, G.: Estudio de suelos en la Comarca de los Pedroches  
12 (Córdoba.). *An. Edaf. Agrob.* 45(7-8), 989-1012, 1986.

13 Ruhe, R.V., and Walker, P.H.: Hillslope models and soil formation: I. open systems. In:  
14 Holmes, J.W. (Ed.). *Trans. Int. Congr. Soil Sci. 9th Adelaide*, 4. Elsevier, NY, pp. 551-560,  
15 1968.

16 Ruiz-Sinoga, J.D., and Diaz, A.R.: Soil degradation factors along a Mediterranean  
17 pluviometric gradient in Southern Spain. *Geomorphology* 118(3), 359-368, 2010.

18 Ruiz-Sinoga, J.D., Pariente, S., Diaz, A.R., and Martínez-Murillo, F.J.: Variability of  
19 relationships between soil organic carbon and some soil properties in Mediterranean  
20 rangelands under different climatic conditions (South of Spain). *Catena* 94, 17-25, 2012.

21 Rusco, E., Jones, R.J., and Bidoglio, G.: Organic Matter in the soils of Europe: Present status  
22 and future trends. EUR 20556 EN. JRC, Official Publications of the European Communities,  
23 Luxembourg, 2001.

24 Shertha, B.M., Sitala, B.K., Singh, B.R., and Bajracharya, R.M.: Soil organic carbon stocks  
25 in soil aggregates under different land use systems in Nepal. *Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosys.* 70, 201-  
26 213, 2004.

27 SPSS Inc.: SPSS for windows, Version 13.0. Chicago, SPSS Inc., 2004.

28 Srinivasarao, C.H., Venkateswarlu, B., Lal, R., Singh, A.K., Kundu, S., Vittal, K.P.R., Patel,  
29 J., and Patel, M.M.: Long-term manuring and fertilizer effects on depletion of soil organic

1 stocks under Pearl millet-cluster bean-castor rotation in Western India. Land Degrad.  
2 Develop. 25, 173-183, 2014.

3 Tsui, C.C., Tsai, C.C., and Chen, Z.S.: Soil organic carbon stocks in relation to elevation  
4 gradients in volcanic ash soils of Taiwan. Geoderma 209-210, 119-127, 2013.

5 Umakant, M., Ussiri, D., and Lal, R.: Tillage effects on soil organic carbon storage and  
6 dynamics in Corn Belt of Ohio USA. Soil Till. Res. 107(2), 88-96, 2010.

7 USDA.: Soil survey laboratory methods manual, Soil survey investigation report No. 42.  
8 Version 4.0. USDA-NCRS, Lincoln, NE, 2004.

9 Venterea, R.T., Lovett, G.M., Groffman, P.M., and Schwarz, P.A.: Landscape patterns of net  
10 nitrification in a northern hardwood conifer forest. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 67, 527-539, 2003.

11 Wang, Q., Wang, S., Xu, G., and Fan, B.: Conversion of secondary broadleaved forest into  
12 Chinese fir plantation alters litter production and potential nutrient returns. Plant Ecol. 209,  
13 269-278, 2010.

14 Wang, Y.Q., and Shao, M.A.: Spatial variability of soil physical properties in a region of the  
15 loess plateau of PR China subject to wind and water erosion. Land Degrad. Develop. 24, 296-  
16 304, 2013.

17 Yan-Gui, S., Xin-Rong, L., Ying-Wu, C., Zhi-Shan, Z., and Yan, L.: Carbon fixation of  
18 cyanobacterial-algal crusts after desertification and its implication to soil organic matter  
19 accumulation in Desert. Land Degrad. Develop. 24, 342-349, 2013.

20 Ziadat, F.M.: Analyzing digital terrain attributes to predict soil attributes for a relatively large  
21 area. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 69, 1590-1599, 2005.

22 Ziadat, F.M., and Taimeh, A.Y.: Effect of rainfall intensity, slope and land use and antecedent  
23 soil moisture on soil erosion in an arid environment. Land Degrad. Develop. 24, 582-590,  
24 2013.

25

26

1 Table 1. Soil groups of the study area at each of the seven topographic positions with properties. The key refers to the reference soil groups of the IUSS  
 2 Working Group WRB (2006) with lists of qualifiers.

Topographic position	m.a.s.l. <sup>a</sup>	Slope %	Parent material	Vegetation	Soil groups	Qualifiers	n <sup>b</sup>
A	1168	15.3	Quartzite - Sandstone	Maritime pine ( <i>Pinus pinaster</i> ) Holm oak ( <i>Quercus ilex</i> ) Gum rockrose ( <i>Cistus ladanifer</i> )	Leptosols - LP	Mollic - mo	2
B	1009	16.5	Quartzite - Sandstone	Holm oak ( <i>Quercus ilex</i> ) Cork oak ( <i>Quercus suber</i> ) Strawberry tree ( <i>Arbutus unedo</i> ) Gum rockrose ( <i>Cistus ladanifer</i> )	Regosols - RG Leptosols - LP Cambisols - CM	Eutric - eu Mollic - mo Humic - hu	3
C	945	20.8	Quartzite - Sandstone	Stone pine ( <i>Pinus pinea</i> ) Mastic ( <i>Pistacia lentiscus</i> )	Cambisols - CM Regosols - RG Phaeozems - PH	Humic - hu Dystric - dy Luvic - lv	3
D	865	5.5	Quartzite	Portuguese oak ( <i>Quercus faginea</i> ) Strawberry tree ( <i>Arbutus unedo</i> ) Gum rockrose ( <i>Cistus ladanifer</i> )	Regosols - RG	Umbric - um	2
E	778	10.7	Quartzite - Slates	Holm oak ( <i>Quercus ilex</i> ) Strawberry tree ( <i>Arbutus unedo</i> ) Gum rockrose ( <i>Cistus ladanifer</i> )	Leptosols - LP	Umbric - um	3
F	695	12.0	Quartzite	Cork oak ( <i>Quercus suber</i> ) Holm oak ( <i>Quercus ilex</i> ) Strawberry tree ( <i>Arbutus unedo</i> ) Gum rockrose ( <i>Cistus ladanifer</i> )	Leptosols - LP	Litic - li	2
G	607	18.5	Slates	Holm oak ( <i>Quercus ilex</i> ) Mastic ( <i>Pistacia lentiscus</i> )	Leptosols - LP	Mollic - mo	2

3 <sup>a</sup> Metres above sea level; <sup>b</sup> Sample size

1 Table 2. Methods used in field measurements, laboratory analysis and to make calculations from study data.

2

Parameters	Method
Field measurements	
Bulk density (Mg m <sup>-3</sup> )	Cylindrical core sampler* (Blake and Hartge, 1986)
Laboratory analysis	
Particle size distribution	Robinson pipette method (USDA, 2004)**
pH – H <sub>2</sub> O	Volumetric with Bernard calcimeter (Duchaufour, 1975)
Organic C (%)	Walkley and Black method (Nelson and Sommers, 1982)
Parameters calculated from study data	
SOC stock (Mg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	(SOC concentration×BD×d×(1- $\delta_{2mm}$ %)×0.1) *** (IPCC, 2003)
Total SOC stock (Mg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	$\Sigma_{\text{horizons}}$ SOC Stock <sub>horizon</sub> (IPCC, 2003)

3 \* 3 cm diameter, 10 cm length and 70.65 cm<sup>3</sup> volume.4 \*\* Prior to determining the particle size distribution, samples were treated with H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (6%) to remove organic matter (OM). Particles larger than 2 mm were  
5 determined by wet sieving and smaller particles were classified according to USDA standards (2004).6 \*\*\* Where SOC is the organic carbon content (g Kg<sup>-1</sup>), d the thickness of the soil layer (cm),  $\delta_{2mm}$  is the fractional percentage (%) of soil mineral particles >2  
7 mm in size in the soil, and BD the soil bulk density (Mg m<sup>-3</sup>).

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1 Table 3. Properties of the soils evaluated (average  $\pm$  SD\*) in the Despeñaperros Nature Reserve.

Topographic position	m.a.s.l. m	SCS	Depth cm	Gravel %	Sand %	Silt %	Clay %	B.D. Mg m <sup>-3</sup>	O.M. g kg <sup>-1</sup>	pH H <sub>2</sub> O
A	1168	S1	0-25	33.1 $\pm$ 13.8 aA	56.5 $\pm$ 1.1 aA	22.3 $\pm$ 3.0 aA	21.2 $\pm$ 4.1 aA	1.1 $\pm$ 0.19 aA	64.5 $\pm$ 8.9 aA	6.3 $\pm$ 0.7 aA
			25-50	7.0 $\pm$ 3.1 bA	39.3 $\pm$ 0.81 bA	30.7 $\pm$ 4.2 aA	30.0 $\pm$ 6.1 aA	1.5 $\pm$ 0.21 bA	0.99 $\pm$ 0.21 bA	5.3 $\pm$ 0.5 bA
B	1009	S1	0-25	17.0 $\pm$ 10.0 aB	52.9 $\pm$ 29.8 aA	29.9 $\pm$ 30.6 aA	17.2 $\pm$ 5.3 aA	1.1 $\pm$ 0.10 aA	68.6 $\pm$ 5.2 aA	5.9 $\pm$ 0.4 aA
			25-50	27.1 $\pm$ 6.4 bB	58.7 $\pm$ 20.1 aB	19.1 $\pm$ 12.2 bB	22.1 $\pm$ 8.0 aB	1.3 $\pm$ 0.12 aB	35.3 $\pm$ 3.4 bB	5.6 $\pm$ 0.7 aA
			50-75	14.3 $\pm$ 16.9 aA	41.6 $\pm$ 18.1 bA	25.7 $\pm$ 15.2 aA	32.6 $\pm$ 2.9 bA	1.5 $\pm$ 0.12 bA	10.5 $\pm$ 2.8 cA	5.7 $\pm$ 0.5 aA
C	945	S1	0-25	34.0 $\pm$ 5.5 aA	59.2 $\pm$ 7.2 aA	24.7 $\pm$ 3.1 aA	16.1 $\pm$ 6.2 aA	1.2 $\pm$ 0.10 aA	58.0 $\pm$ 9.5 aA	5.9 $\pm$ 0.8 aA
			25-50	14.4 $\pm$ 7.2 bC	36.1 $\pm$ 12.2 bA	28.2 $\pm$ 2.5 aA	35.7 $\pm$ 14.1 bA	1.3 $\pm$ 0.06 aB	30.9 $\pm$ 6.3 bB	5.5 $\pm$ 0.4 aA
			50-75	14.9 $\pm$ 11.9 bA	24.4 $\pm$ 15.9 cB	30.4 $\pm$ 9.8 aA	45.2 $\pm$ 16.2 cB	1.5 $\pm$ 0.05 aA	0.99 $\pm$ 0.12 cB	5.2 $\pm$ 0.6 aA
D	865	S1	0-25	39.9 $\pm$ 6.2 aA	47.6 $\pm$ 19.3 aB	38.1 $\pm$ 7.5 aB	14.3 $\pm$ 2.1 aA	1.1 $\pm$ 0.09 aA	62.9 $\pm$ 10.4 aA	5.6 $\pm$ 1.0 aA
			25-50	24.0 $\pm$ 4.5 bB	46.6 $\pm$ 18.2 aC	36.2 $\pm$ 7.9 aA	17.2 $\pm$ 5.4 aB	1.3 $\pm$ 0.10 aB	35.9 $\pm$ 7.6 bB	5.7 $\pm$ 0.8 aA
			50-75	11.9 $\pm$ 10.2 cA	30.9 $\pm$ 11.1 bB	47.1 $\pm$ 5.4 bB	22.0 $\pm$ 6.8 aC	1.5 $\pm$ 0.13 bA	1.0 $\pm$ 0.30 cB	4.5 $\pm$ 0.4 bB
E	778	S1	0-25	25.5 $\pm$ 6.8 aC	52.2 $\pm$ 7.2 aA	30.2 $\pm$ 5.1 aA	17.6 $\pm$ 2.4 aA	1.2 $\pm$ 0.13 aA	56.3 $\pm$ 8.9 aA	5.7 $\pm$ 0.7 aA
F	695	S1	0-25	28.2 $\pm$ 7.4 aC	34.2 $\pm$ 5.3 aC	41.0 $\pm$ 9.8 aB	24.8 $\pm$ 2.8 aA	1.2 $\pm$ 0.14 aA	46.9 $\pm$ 7.4 aB	6.3 $\pm$ 0.5 aA
G	607	S1	0-25	42.9 $\pm$ 19.3 aD	54.9 $\pm$ 4.1 aA	27.7 $\pm$ 2.5 aA	17.3 $\pm$ 6.6 aA	1.3 $\pm$ 0.13 aB	54.9 $\pm$ 9.2 aB	6.2 $\pm$ 0.7 aA

2 m.a.s.l.: Metres above sea level; SCS: Soil control section; BD: Bulk density; O.M.: Organic matter.

3 \*Standard deviation.

4 Numbers followed by different lower case letters within the same column have significant differences ( $P<0.05$ ) at different depths, considering the same topographic position. Numbers followed by different capital letters within the same column have significant differences ( $P<0.05$ ) considering the same SCS at different topographic position.

1 Table 4. Soil organic carbon (SOC) content and soil organic carbon stock (SOCS) (average  $\pm$  SD\*) in the Despeñaperros Nature Reserve.

Topographic position	Elevation m.a.s.l.	SCS	SOC g kg <sup>-1</sup>	T-SOC g kg <sup>-1</sup>	SOCS Mg ha <sup>-1</sup>	T-SOCS Mg ha <sup>-1</sup>
A	1168	S1	37.5 $\pm$ 16.8 aA	38.1 $\pm$ 8.4 A	70.8 $\pm$ 33.5 aA	72.9 $\pm$ 17.0 A
		S2	0.58 $\pm$ 0.09 bA		2.1 $\pm$ 0.57 bA	
B	1009	S1	39.9 $\pm$ 10.3 aA	66.6 $\pm$ 8.2 B	91.1 $\pm$ 13.2 aB	158.0 $\pm$ 15.8 B
		S2	20.5 $\pm$ 6.4 bB		49.8 $\pm$ 14.9 bB	
		S3	6.1 $\pm$ 7.8 cA		19.1 $\pm$ 19.2 cA	
C	945	S1	33.7 $\pm$ 8.6 aA	52.3 $\pm$ 5.9 C	67.4 $\pm$ 9.7 aA	119.3 $\pm$ 10.9 C
		S2	18.0 $\pm$ 9.1 bB		50.1 $\pm$ 22.4 bB	
		S3	0.58 $\pm$ 0.09 cB		1.8 $\pm$ 0.26 cB	
D	865	S1	36.6 $\pm$ 7.9 aA	58.1 $\pm$ 5.7 C	62.1 $\pm$ 8.9 aA	116.1 $\pm$ 8.6 C
		S2	20.9 $\pm$ 9.0 bB		52.1 $\pm$ 16.7 bB	
		S3	0.57 $\pm$ 0.09 cB		1.9 $\pm$ 0.30 cB	
E	778	S1	32.7 $\pm$ 13.2 aA	32.7 $\pm$ 13.2 A	72.6 $\pm$ 25.0 aA	72.6 $\pm$ 0.65 A
F	695	S1	27.3 $\pm$ 15.1 aB	27.3 $\pm$ 15.1 A	59.3 $\pm$ 27.3 aC	59.3 $\pm$ 27.3 A
G	607	S1	31.9 $\pm$ 13.1 aB	31.9 $\pm$ 13.1 A	53.8 $\pm$ 18.3 aC	53.8 $\pm$ 18.3 A

2  
3 m.a.s.l.: Metres above sea level; SCS: Soil control section; SOC: Soil organic carbon; T-SOC: Total SOC; SOCS: Soil organic carbon stock; T-SOCS: Total  
4 SOCS.

5 \*Standard deviation.

6 Numbers followed by different lower case letters within the same column have significant differences ( $P<0.05$ ) at different depths, considering the same  
7 topographic position. Numbers followed by different capital letters within the same column have significant differences ( $P<0.05$ ) considering the same SCS at  
8 different topographic position.

