

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

This discussion paper is/has been under review for the journal Solid Earth (SE).
Please refer to the corresponding final paper in SE if available.

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai¹, Z. Liu^{1,2}, H. Shao^{3,4}, and Z. Yang¹

¹Forestry College of Guizhou University, Guiyang 550025, China

²Anshun Xixiu District Water Conservancy Bureau, Anshun 561000, China

³Key Laboratory of Coastal Biology and Bioresources Utilization, Yantai Institute of Coastal Zone Research (YIC), Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS), Yantai 264003, China

⁴Institute of Agro-biotechnology, Jiangsu Academy of Agricultural Sciences, Nanjing 210014, China

Received: 10 April 2015 – Accepted: 29 April 2015 – Published: 5 June 2015

Correspondence to: Q. Dai (qhdairiver@163.com) and H. Shao (shaohongbochu@126.com)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

Title Page

Abstract Introduction

Conclusions References

Tables Figures

◀ ▶

◀ ▶

Back Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Abstract

The influence on soil erosion by different bedrock bareness ratios, different rainfall intensities, different underground pore fissure degrees and rainfall duration are researched through manual simulation of microrelief characteristics of karst bare slopes and underground karst crack construction in combination with artificial simulation of rainfall experiment. The results show that firstly, when the rainfall intensity is small (30 and 50 mm h⁻¹), no bottom load loss is produced on the surface, and surface and underground runoff and sediment production is increased with the increasing of rainfall intensity; secondly, surface runoff and sediment production reduced with increased underground pore fissure degree, while underground runoff and sediment production increased; thirdly, raindrops hit the surface, forming a crust with rainfall duration. The formation of crusts increases surface runoff erosion and reduces soil infiltration rate. Increasing of surface runoff erosion damaged crust and increased soil seepage rate. Raindrops continued to hit the surface, leading the formation of crust. Soil permeability showed volatility which were from reduction to increases and reduction, and so on. Surface and subsurface runoff were volatility with rainfall duration; fourthly, when rock bareness ratio is 50% and rainfall intensities are 30 and 50 mm h⁻¹, runoff is not produced on the surface, and the slope runoff and sediment production presents a fluctuating change with increased rock bareness ratio; fifthly, the correlation degree between the slope runoff and sediment production and all factors are as follows: rainfall intensity > rainfall duration > underground pore fissure degree > bed rock bareness ratio.

1 Introduction

Karst region have surface and underground double-layer karst structures. A large amount of bed rocks are bared and the soil cover is not continuous. The heterogeneity of karst structure is great due to developed fissures, ponors and underground rivers. A part of water and soil enter the underground rivers along with the fissures and the

SED

7, 1639–1671, 2015

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



ponors, so that water and soil loss in karst regions is classified into surface loss and underground soil leak, which have obvious difference compared with that in non-karst regions such as agricultural land reported by Cerdà et al. (2009a, b, 2010) and García-Orenes et al. (2009). In non-karst region, soil erosion is mainly related to surface cover, slope, and rainfall conditions (Cerdà 2000; Giménez Morera et al., 2010; Biro et al., 2013; Haregeweyn et al., 2013;) and it could be prevented if people take reasonable measures (Haile and Fetene, 2012; Prokop and Poręba, 2012; Mandal and Sharda, 2013). However, due to special geologic structure in karst region, soil erosion is rather more complicated than that in non-karst region.

In China, the area of the karst region can reach 3.463 million km² according to the distribution area of carbonate rocks (including buried karst), 2.06 million km² according to the bared area of strata containing carbonate rocks, and 0.907 million km² according to the bared area of carbonate rocks, and southwest karst region in China is the biggest karst continuous region in the world (Sweeting, 1993), the soil erosion harm of karst mountainous areas is as great as the harm of Loess Plateau areas, so that enhancing the work of water and soil conservation in karst regions and governing the soil erosion of drainage basins admit of no delay. Nowadays, soil erosion occurred in this region has caused serious soil and water losses and has become another important environmental problem after Loess Plateau of China (Zhao et al., 2013). For the past few years, a large amount of research on water and soil loss in karst regions has been performed, and certain achievements has been achieved.

Influence factors of karst bare slope runoff yield are mainly divided into 3 types: rainfall characteristics, drainage basin underlying surface and drainage basin evapotranspiration characteristics. Surface runoff process indicates a process that part of rainfall with the capacity being larger than slope soil infiltration capacity forms runoff on the surface; underground runoff indicates that rainfall flows into rivers after infiltrating into the an underground water-bearing layer, so as to form runoff. Atmospheric precipitation infiltration forms underground water or depression detention consumption, only when the rainfall capacity is larger than the underlying surface consumption or the

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



rainfall intensity is larger than the soil infiltration rate, the slope can yield runoff (Liu and Wu, 1997). The slope runoff yielding process can be divided into the following three steps: the first step is that rainfall begins infiltration and is completely infiltrated; in the second step, infiltration and runoff are generated at the same time, wherein infiltration and runoff curves have similar linear relations; the third step belongs to a runoff step in which infiltration can be ignored (Sidle et al., 1995; Zhang et al., 2000; Daniel, 1998).

It is incontrovertible that surface and underground loss exists in karst region, but people always ignore underground water and soil loss research and only pay attention to studying surface water and soil loss during the research on water and soil loss in karst region. The researches comprise monitoring soil surface erosion state in karst regions through runoff plot (Wu et al., 2005; Chen et al., 2007; Peng et al., 2008; Li et al., 2009), research on surface soil erosion characteristics in different slope positions in karst regions through ^{137}Cs (Fu et al., 2007; Z. Zhang et al., 2007; Timothy et al., 1999; Bissonnais et al., 2005), research on soil erosion and weathering process in small drainage basins through U-system method (Anthony et al., 2008), research on the influence on soil erosion in karst regions by rainfall intensity through indoor simulation tests (Cai et al., 2009), speculation on soil erosion state in Yunnan Stone Forest Regions through stalagmite records (Cai et al., 2003), monitoring surface water and soil loss in karst regions through anchored piles, desilting basins and check dams (Zhang et al., 2003; Peng and Yang, 2001; Long, 2006), and research on surface erosion characteristics in karst regions through magnetic trace method (Royall, 2001). Dong et al. (2006) calculated water and soil loss vector or analyzing water and soil loss sensibility in karst regions by directly applying the existing water and soil loss models through GIS. Gao et al. (2010) researched different types of soil erosion characteristics in Guizhou by measuring soil antishock coefficients, disintegration coefficients and erodibility and Li et al. (2007) researched grading standards of water and soil loss in karst regions and presented a series of grading standards suitable for water and soil loss in karst regions according to special lithological characters in karst regions. The above scholars mainly performed research in the aspect of surface water and soil loss

characteristics, but as karst regions do not only have surface loss, but also have underground soil leakage, the water and soil loss characteristics in karst regions can be more accurately reflected only by integrating the analysis and research on surface water and soil loss and underground soil leakage.

5 In recent years, with the constant depth of research on karst regions, some scholars did theoretical research on surface and underground loss in karst regions in a macroscopic view. Zhou et al. (2009) researched water and soil loss and soil leakage modes in Puding karst regions, generalized the water and soil loss and soil leakage modes
10 in karst regions, discussed the relation among raindrop splash erosion, slop erosion, ponor leakage and underground river migration during the water and soil loss process, and theoretically analyzed the action mechanism of water and soil loss in karst regions. Geissenon et al. (1996) macroscopically analyzed surface and underground leakage modes in Mexico, can successfully predicate ponor and high-risk regions of karst pipelines by applying classification trees, so that soil erosion risk graphs and
15 water and soil conservation plans can also be made according to classification trees in the condition that no expert guidance exists, but surface soil erosion degrees under different types cannot be successfully predicted. Zhang et al. (2009) proposed that karst mountain area soil loss comprises chemical loss, physical loss and biological loss, wherein physical loss comprises surface loss and underground loss. Kheir
20 et al. (2008) evaluated water and soil loss sensibility states in Mediterranean karst regions through RS and GIS, assessment indexes comprise landform, soil, land-use type and rainfall erosion indexes, and also comprise rock leakage, including influence on water and soil loss by lithological characters, drainage density and karst landform, Wang et al. (2009) analyzed the underground water and soil loss mechanism in karst
25 regions. Chai et al. (1989) obtained the result that the soil loss tolerance in Guangxi karst region is $68 \text{ t}(\text{km}^2 \text{ a})^{-1}$ according to the corrosion speed of carbonate rocks in Guangxi, and X. Zhang et al. (2007) proposed a viewpoint that reasonable erosion amount is required to replace the acceptable erosion for karst regions. The consensus that lithologic character difference causes water and soil loss in karst regions different

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



from water and soil loss in non karst regions is gradually achieved. Simultaneously soil leakage rates in karst regions are hugely different from each other because of different lithologic character combinations and different pore fissure development levels. For example, Z. Zhang et al. (2007) proposed that the soil leakage can reach 100 % in pure limestone areas, and the soil leakage can also be as low as zero in non-pure limestone areas. The above underground leakage is mainly researched from a large scale perspective, and few people do research from a micro perspective, so that combining environmental factors and geological factors and analyzing soil leakage mechanism in karst regions from a micro perspective are very important.

In this paper, the influences of pore fissure degrees, bed rock bareness ratios, rainfall intensities and rainfall duration on soil erosion in karst region was researched by combination of surface and underground soil erosion under artificial simulation rainfall condition. Results obtained in this paper would provide a theoretical basis for subsequent researching on the relationship between underground and surface water and soil loss in karst region and, simultaneously, provide a reference for controlling soil erosion and water loss in karst region.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Study area

Soil for testing was collected in a typical karst region (26°28'32'' N, 106°42'02'' E) in Huaxi district, Guizhou province in China (Fig. 1). The study area has a subtropical humid monsoon climate with a mean annual temperature of 14.9 °C, annual precipitation of 110 mm, annual frost-free period of 260 days or more and effective accumulated temperature of 4500 °C. The land area of bedrock bared accounted for 23.8 % of total area. The main component of bared bedrock is carbonate rocks with the lowest size of 25 cm.

Soil texture is a carbonated developed-calcareous clay loam and soil particle compositions are shown in Table 1.

2.2 Test equipment

Test equipment mainly comprises of a rainfall simulator and a steel tank (Fig. 2). The rainfall simulator is a portable fully-automatic rain maker with four stainless steel down-sprayer produced by Xi'an Qingyuan Measurement and Control Technology Co., Ltd (Model: QYJY-501). This simulator system was similar to that described by Cerdà (1998); the height of sprayer was 6 m; the rain intensity can be adjusted from 10 to 200 mm h⁻¹; and the effective area of rainfall is 6.5 m × 6.5 m and uniformity of rain-drops distribution is more than 85%. The length of steel tank is 4 m, the width is 1.5 m and the depth is 35 cm. Total of 192 drainage holes with a diameter of 5 cm were uniformly formed at the bottom of tank for free-drainage of infiltrating water. The porosity of drainage holes at the bottom of tank can be adjusted from 0 to 6% to simulate varied pore fissure degrees of underground bedrock. During the experiment, surface runoff and underground runoff from drainage outlets can be collected respectively at the lower end of the steel tank.

2.3 Test design

The pore fissure degrees of a tank bottom plate were 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5%; the bareness ratios of slope bedrock were 10, 20, 30, 40 and 50%; the rainfall intensities were 30, 50, 80, 120 and 150 mm h⁻¹; the rainfall duration was 90 min for all rainfall events; total of 9 measurement durations were completed and each duration was 10 min; the soil compactness was 1070, 760 and 410 kPa from the lower part to the upper part. This compactness is similar to the actual measurement in field. According to a previous research reported by Tian et al. (2005), the critical slope of the changes of soil erosion intensity is approximately 25°. In this paper, experimental slope is 25°. The test repeated twice.

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



2.4 Soil layer simulation

The procedure to prepare each soil layer was as follows: first carbonate rocks were randomly arranged in the steel tank and the sizes of rocks were random. Secondly, soil was homogeneously backfilled in space of rocks in layer-by-layer with hands and rakes to simulate different bareness ratios of slope bed rocks. The total depth of soil layer was 30 cm, which is the average soil layer thickness in the field bared slope characteristic according to investigation results. During soil filling, the soil layer was divided into 3 sub-layers from the lower part to the upper part. For each sub-layer, the thickness of soil was 10 cm, but the amount of soil was not constant. After placing the soil, it was slightly packed with a wooden block in order to obtain needed soil compactness for each sub-layer. A soil compactness measurer was used to measure soil compactness. As procedures described above, we can simulated four bareness ratios of slope bed rocks, i.e., 10, 20, 30, 40 and 50 %.

2.5 Sample collection

When rainfall test is begun, the test design begins timing when runoff is produced from the surface and underground, then runoff sediment samples are collected through a plastic small bucket by taking 10 min as unit and then are transferred into a 65 L plastic large bucket with scales marked, which is used for calculating the accumulated runoff amount, water sample is filled at the middle layer part of the bucket through a water bottle after being blended, the weight of soil in the water bottle is measured, and then the suspended load loss amount can be obtained through the ratio of the water volume in the water bottle to the water volume in the small bucket; water in the small bucket is poured out, and the amount of soil deposited at the bottom of the small bucket is the bottom load loss amount.

Data statistical analysis was performed through SPSS Statistics17.0 software.

SED

7, 1639–1671, 2015

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



3 Results and analysis

3.1 Analysis on influence on slope runoff and sediment production by rainfall intensity

The influence on slope runoff and sediment production by rainfall intensity is very obvious, and the relationship between rainfall intensity and slope runoff and sediment production is closed. With the increasing of rainfall intensity, the increasing rate of slope accumulated sediment amount is higher than that of accumulated runoff amount (Zhu et al., 2009); runoff is increased with the increasing of rainfall intensity, and under identical rainfall intensity, the erosion amount of surface with loose deposits is the greatest, the erosion amount of excavated bare areas takes second place, and the erosion amount of surface with vegetation cover is the lowest (Li and He, 2006; Leh et al., 2013); soil erosion is obviously increased with the increasing of rainfall intensity, the influence on soil erosion by rainfall intensity is the biggest in the bare slope condition, the influence on soil erosion by slope length and by slope gradient is the approximately the same, the more the slope length is and the steeper the slope surface is, the higher the soil erosion is, and conversely the lower soil erosion is (Wang et al., 2004; Ziadat and Yaimeh, 2013).

For the influence on soil erosion by rainfall intensity, the statistical results refer to Table 2, and the table shows that slop runoff and sediment amounts are increased with the increasing of the rainfall intensity, surface soil is lost in bottom load and suspended load mode, and underground soil is lost in a suspended load mode. When the rainfall intensity is low (30 mm h^{-1}), underground runoff amount is higher than surface runoff amount, while the rainfall intensity is high (150 mm h^{-1}), underground runoff amount is smaller than surface runoff amount, this shows that the variation amplitude of the surface runoff amount is higher than that of underground runoff amount because the soil permeability variation is slight when the underground pore fissure degree is not changed, the rainfall capacity is continuously increased with the increasing of rainfall intensity, except permeated rainfall amount, the rainfall amount is lost along with sur-

SED

7, 1639–1671, 2015

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

face, and then the variation amplitude of the surface runoff amount is higher; when the rainfall intensity is low ($30, 50 \text{ mm h}^{-1}$), bottom load loss is not produced on the surface because the surface runoff is small, the tractive force is small, only small soil particle is lost with runoff suspension, only suspended load loss is produced, and only when the rainfall is increased to 80 mm h^{-1} , bottom load and suspended load loss are produced on the surface; from the surface soil loss amount, it can be seen that soil is mainly lost in a surface suspended load mode, then soil is lost in an underground suspended load mode in the second place, and soil is lost in a surface bottom load in the third place; the increasing rate of accumulated sediment yield is higher than that of accumulated runoff yield according to the increasing rate of accumulated runoff and sediment amounts, and this result is similar with the research result of Zhu et al. (2009).

By taking rainfall intensity as a variable and corresponding accumulated runoff and sediment production as dependent variables to perform regression analysis and multi-model fitting selection, the obtained fitting results refer to Table 3, the table shows that optimally the regression relationship model between rainfall intensity and slope surface and underground runoff and sediment production take linear quadratic polynomial, except fitting determination coefficient of underground accumulated runoff amount, other fitting determination coefficients are larger than 0.9 and reach significance level, this shows that the relation between slope surface and underground runoff and sediment production and rainfall intensity is close, and the relation is positively correlated; established models based on multiple simulation rainfall results can be used for predicating the trend of water and soil loss in the southwest karst regions, and can be used for evaluating long-term effects of various measures on karst region governance by being coupled into regional models.

3.2 Influence on slope runoff and sediment production by underground pore fissure degree

The statistical results of the influence on slop runoff and sediment production by underground pore fissure degree refer to Table 4, in the table, rainfall data with different

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



pore fissure degrees in identical conditions (the rock bareness ratio is 30 %, the slope gradient is 25° and the runoff yielding time is 90 min) are taken as examples, and from the Table 4, it can be seen that surface soil is lost in bottom load and suspended load modes, and underground soil is lost in a suspended load mode; when the pore fissures are the same, surface and underground runoff and sediment amounts are increased with the increasing of rainfall intensity, and the variation amplitude of accumulated sediment amount is larger than that of accumulated runoff amount; when the rainfall intensity is smaller (30 mm h⁻¹) and the underground pore fissure degree is larger (3, 4 and 5 %), bottom load loss is produced on the surface, and only suspended load loss is produced because the soil permeability is high when the underground pore fissure degree is large and the rainfall intensity is small, the surface runoff is small, only small soil particle is lost with runoff suspension, and suspended load loss is not produced; when the rainfall intensity is not changed, surface runoff and sediment amounts are reduced with the increasing of the underground pore fissure degree, while the underground runoff and sediment amounts are the opposite and continuously increased because the underground pore fissure degree is increased, the leakage rate is increased, the surface runoff and sediment yields are reduced, and the underground runoff and sediment yields are increased. When the underground pore fissure is 1 % and the rainfall intensity is 150 mm h⁻¹, the total soil erosion intensity is the highest, the total erosion amount reaches 33.2 g min⁻¹, and when the underground pore fissure is 5 %, the total erosion intensity is the lowest.

By taking underground pore fissure degree as a variable and accumulated runoff and sediment production as dependent variables to perform regression analysis, the obtained results refer to Table 5, the table shows that the surface runoff and sediment production and underground pore fissure degree form a negative relationship, while the underground runoff and sediment production and underground fissure degree form a positive relationship; fitting determination coefficients are larger than 0.8 and reach significance level, this shows that the relation between slop surface and underground sediment production and rainfall intensity is close; established models based on multi-

ple simulation rainfall results can be used for predicating the trend of karst water and soil loss in the southwest region, and can be used for evaluating long-term effects of various measures on karst regional governance by being coupled into regional models.

3.3 Influence on slope runoff and sediment production on rainfall duration

5 Surface and underground runoff and sediment production presents different change rules along with rainfall duration (Table 6), and in the table, the pore fissure is 3%, the rock bareness ratio is 30 %, the slope gradient is 25° and the rainfall intensity is 50 mm h⁻¹. From the table, it can be seen that soil is mainly lost in a surface suspended load mode, the surface suspended load loss is about 2/3 of the total soil loss amount, and ground suspended loss takes the second plate; Raindrops hit the surface, forming a crust with rainfall duration. The formation of crusts increases surface runoff erosion and reduce soil infiltration rate. Increasing of surface runoff erosion damaged crust and increased soil seepage rate. Raindrops continued to hit the surface, leading the formation of crust. Soil permeability showed volatility which were from reduction to increases and reduction, and so on. Surface and subsurface runoff were volatility with rainfall duration, and the result is similar with the research result of Chen et al. (2011).

15 Figure 2 is the relationship of rainfall duration and all accumulated amounts, from the figure it can be seen that surface and underground accumulated runoff and sediment yielding amounts and rainfall duration form a negative relationship, the bottom load produced on the surface is smallest, the variation amplitude is the smallest and nearly a horizontal line, and the slope $k = 1.7314$; the variation amplitude of surface accumulated runoff amount is the largest, and the slope $k = 25.183$; the regression relation model fitting results of surface and underground runoff and sediment production and rainfall duration refer to Table 7.

SED

7, 1639–1671, 2015

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



3.4 Influence on slope runoff and sediment production by rock bareness ratio

Stony desertification classification is determined according to rock bareness intensity, the rock bareness ratio of severe stony desertification regions is larger than 80 %, the rock bareness ratio of moderate stony desertification regions is larger than 70 %, and when the rock bareness ratio of mild stony desertification regions is larger than 60 % (Hu et al., 2008), soil cover in the mild stony desertification regions is basically continuous, and the regions belong to arable exploitable regions; in the paper, researched highest rock bareness ratio is 50 %, and the region belongs to the arable exploitable region scope, and does not belongs to the scope of mild stony desertification.

For the influence on sloop runoff and sediment production by rock bareness ratio, in this paper, the pore fissure is 3 %, the slope gradient is 25° and the rainfall intensity is 90 mm h⁻¹, and the statistical results refer to Table 7, from the table it can be seen that when the rainfall intensity is low (30 mm h⁻¹), no bottom load loss is produced on the surface, and only suspended load loss is produced; when the rock bareness ratio is 50 % and the rainfall intensity is 30 and 50 mm h⁻¹, no runoff is produced on the surface, so that only underground water and soil loss is produced on the surface; with the increasing of the bed rock bareness ratio, the surface allowable infiltration area is reduced, the impermeable area is increased, and the effect on preventing rainfall leakage by bared bed rock is increased, so that the soil and water infiltration loss amount is reduced, but the soft and hard contact surface between soil and rock and the intercept effect on rainfall by surface are increased relatively, and the water and soil infiltration rate is increased on the contrary, so that the soil leakage loss depends on the bed rock bareness ratio and the soft and hard contact surface between soil and rock. When the rainfall intensity is 150 mm h⁻¹ and the rock bareness ratio is 10 %. Allow infiltration of surface area is larger, impervious area is smaller, the soil infiltration rate is larger; the rock bareness ratio is increased from 10 to 20 %, allow infiltration of surface area reduced, impervious area increased, so the soil infiltration rate decreases; when the rock bareness ratio is increased from 20 to 30 %, allow infiltration of surface area

SED

7, 1639–1671, 2015

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



small ($30, 50 \text{ mm h}^{-1}$), no bottom load loss is produced on the surface, only suspended load loss is produced, and only when the rainfall intensity is increased to 80 mm h^{-1} , bottom load and suspended load loss are produced on the surface; and the increasing rate of accumulated sediment runoff amount is higher than that of accumulated runoff amount.

When the underground pore fissure is not changed, the surface and underground runoff and sediment production is increased with the increasing of rainfall intensity, and the variation amplitude of the accumulated sediment amount is larger than that of accumulated runoff amount; when the rainfall is small (30 mm h^{-1}) and the underground pore fissure is large (3, 4 and 5%), bottom load loss produced on the surface is 0; when the rainfall intensity is not changed, the surface runoff and sediment production is continuously reduced with the increasing of underground pore fissure degree, while the underground runoff and sediment production is contrary and presents a trend of continuously increasing.

Soil is mainly lost in a surface suspended load mode, the surface suspended load loss is about $2/3$ of the total soil loss amount, and ground suspended loss takes the second plate; raindrops hit the surface, forming a crust with rainfall duration. The formation of crusts increases surface runoff erosion and reduce soil infiltration rate. Increasing of surface runoff erosion damaged crust and increased soil seepage rate. Raindrops continued to hit the surface, leading the formation of crust. Soil permeability showed volatility which were from reduction to increases and reduction, and so on. Surface and subsurface runoff were volatility with rainfall duration.

When the rainfall intensity is low (30 mm h^{-1}), no bottom load loss is produced on the surface, and only suspended load loss is produced; when the rock bareness ratio is 50%, and the rainfall intensity is 30 and 50 mm h^{-1} , no runoff is produced on the surface, only underground water and soil loss is produced; when the rainfall intensity is not changed, the slop runoff and sediment product presents a fluctuating change with the increasing of the rock bareness ratio, and when the rock bareness ratio is not changed, the slope runoff and sediment product is increased with the increasing of

rainfall intensity; soil infiltration loss depends on the bed rock bareness ratio and the soft and the hard contact surface between soil and rock.

Acknowledgements. This study is funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (41461057; 41061029), Great Special Foundation of Guizhou Province (in the year of 2014, No.2002) and Projects in the National Science and Technology Pillar Program during the Twelfth Five-year Plan Period (2011BAC02B02). Thanks go to professor of Ni Jiupai, Zhou Chuan, Zhang Yang, Shi Yonglian, Liang Zengfang, Liu Yuejiao for providing help.

References

- Anthony, D., Bernard, B., and Turner, S. P.: Uranium-series isotopes in river materials: insights into the timescales of erosion and sediment transport, *Earth Planet. Sc. Lett.*, 265, 1–17, 2008.
- Bissonnais, Y. L., Cerdan, O., Lecomte, V., Broard, M., and Peter H. K.: Variability of soil surface characteristics influencing runoff and interrill erosion, *Catena*, 62, 111–124, 2005.
- Biro, K., Pradhan, B., Buchroithner, M., Makeschin, F.: Land use/land cover change analysis and its impact on soil properties in the Northern part of Gadarif region, Sudan, *Land Degrad. Dev.*, 24, 90–102, doi:10.1002/ldr.1116, 2013.
- Cai, B., Cheng, H., Hou, J., and Mendel, L.: The Impact of Soil Erosion on The Formation of Yunnan Stone Forest: evidences from Stalagmite and Field Observations, *Quaternary Sciences*, 25, 170–175, 2005.
- Cai, X., W, J., Lei, L., Wang, H., and Li, X.: Laboratorial simulation of different rainfall intensity influence on soil erosion in Southwest Karst area, China, *J. Soil Water Conserv.*, 23, 5–13, 2009.
- Cerdà, A.: The influence of aspect and vegetation on seasonal changes in erosion under rainfall simulation on a clay soil in Spain, *Canadian J. Soil Sci.*, 78, 321–330, 1998.
- Cerdà, A.: Aggregate stability against water forces under different climates on agriculture land and scrubland in southern Bolivia, *Soil Till. Res.*, 36, 1–8, 2000.
- Cerdà, A, Flanagan, D. C., and le Bissonnais, Y.: Soil Erosion and Agriculture, *Soil Till. Res.*, 98–107, doi:10.1016/j.still.2009.10.006, 2009a.

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Cerdà, A., Giménez-Morera, A., y Bodí, M. B.: Soil and water losses from new citrus orchards growing on sloped soils in the western Mediterranean basin, *Earth Surf. Proc. Land.*, 34, 1822–1830, doi:10.1002/esp.1889, 2009b.

Cerdà, A., Hooke, J., and Romero-Díaz, A.: Soil erosion on mediterraneantype-ecosystems, *Land Degrad. Dev.*, 123–136, doi:10.1002/ldr.968, 2010.

Chai, Z.: Study on soil erosion in Guangxi Karst region, *J. Mt. Sci.*, 7, 255–259, 1989.

Chen, Q., Chang, E., Bi, B., Chen, W. T., and Li, D. J.: Comparison between two lands of water and soil conservation in Southeastern Yunnan, *Research of Soil and Water Conservation*, 14, 281–284, 2007.

Chen, Z., Xia, Q., Shi, D., Liu, H. Y., and Wu, S. F.: Soil surface crust characteristic and response feature to slope erosion base on simulation rainfall, *J. Soil Water Conserv.*, 25, 6–11, 2011.

Daniel, H.: *Environmental Soil Physics*, Academic Press, 188–190, 1998.

Dong, Y.: *Slope Soil Erosion Intensity Spatial Characteristics and Soil Erosion Process Based on Magnetic Measurement*, Shandong Agricultural University, 2006.

Fu, W., Zhang, Z., Zhang, H., Zhang, K., and Gu, D. C.: Study on characteristics of soil erosion on Karst hillslope, *J. Soil Water Conserv.*, 21, 38–41, 2007.

Gao, H., Sun, Q., and Yuan, Y.: Characteristics of soil erosion for different land types in Karst areas, *Bulletin of Soil and Water Conservation*, 30, 92–96, 2010.

García-Orenes, F., Cerdà, A., Mataix-Solera, J., Guerrero, C., Bodí, M. B., Arcenegui, V., Zornoza, R., and Sempere, J. G.: Effects of agricultural management on surface soil properties and soil-water losses in eastern Spain, *Soil Till. Res.*, 106, 117–123, doi:10.1016/j.still.2009.06.002, 2009.

Gillieson, D., Wallbrink, P., and Cochran, A.: Vegetation change, erosion risk and land management on the Nullarbor Plain, Australia, *Environ. Geol.*, 28, 145–153, 1996.

Giménez Morera, A., Ruiz Sinoga, J. D., and y Cerdà, A.: The impact of cotton geotextiles on soil and water losses in Mediterranean rainfed agricultural land, *Land Degrad. Dev.*, 43, 210–217, doi:10.1002/ldr.971, 2010.

Haile, G. W. and Fetene, M.: Assessment of soil erosion hazard in Kilie catchment, East Shoa, Ethiopia, *Land Degrad. Dev.*, 23, 293–306, doi:10.1002/ldr.1082, 2012.

Haregeweyn, N., Poesen, J., Verstraeten, G., Govers, G., de Vente, J., Nyssen, J., Deckers, J., and Moeyersons, J.: Assessing the performance of a spatially distributed soil erosion and sediment delivery model (WATEM/SEDEM) in Northern Ethiopia, *Land Degrad. Dev.*, 24, 188–204, doi:10.1002/ldr.1121, 2013.

SED

7, 1639–1671, 2015

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Hu, Y., Liu, Y., Wu, P., Zhao, X. N., and Niu, W. Q.: Rocky desertification in Guangxi karst mountainous area: its tendency, formation causes and rehabilitation, *Journal of Chinese Agricultural Engineering*, 24, 96–100, 2008.
- Kheir, R. B., Abdallah, C., and Khawlie, M.: Assessing soil erosion in Mediterranean karst landscapes of Lebanon using remote sensing and GIS, *Eng. Geol.*, 16, 239–254, 2008.
- Leh, M., Bajwa, S., and Chaubey, I.: Impact of land use change on erosion risk: and integrated remote sensing geographic information system and modeling methodology, *Land Degrad. Dev.*, 24, 409–421, doi:10.1002/ldr.1137, 2013.
- Li, J. and He, Z.: Research on red oil slop runoff and soil erosion under different rainfall intensities, *Environment*, S1, 10–11, 2006.
- Li, S., Ren, H., Yao, X., Zhang, D. Y., and Dai, Q. H.: Study on characteristics of runoff and nutrition loss between different vegetation land in typical karst rock desertification zone, *J. Soil Water Conserv.*, 23, 1–6, 2009.
- Li, Y., Shao, J., Wang, S., Wang, J. X., and Li, X. J.: Assessment of soil erosion sensitivity based on the characteristics of karst ecosystem, *J. Mt. Sci.*, 25, 671–677, 2007.
- Liu, B. and Wu, F.: *Soil Erosion*, Shaanxi People's Publishing House, Xi'an, 1997.
- Long, M.: Water, soil conservation effect and soil erosion models during the ecosystem rehabilitation of karst valleys – taking Huajiang demonstration area as an example, *Chinese Academic Journal (CD) Electronic Journals*, 1–120, 2006.
- Mandal, D. and Sharda, V. N.: Appraisal of soil erosion risk in the Eastern Himalayan region of India for soil conservation planning, *Land Degrad. Dev.*, 24, 430–437, doi:10.1002/ldr.1139, 2013.
- Peng, J. and Yang, M.: On the present soil erosion situation of Huajiang karst gorge in Guizhou province, *J. Mt. Sci.*, 19, 511–515, 2001.
- Peng, T., Wang, S., Zhang, X., Zhao, Q. G., and Chen, T. F.: Results of preliminary monitoring of surface runoff coefficients for karst slopes, *Earth and Environment*, 36, 125–129, 2008.
- Prokop, P. and Poręba, G. J.: Soil erosion associated with an upland farming system under population pressure in Northeast India, *Land Degrad. Dev.*, 23, 310–321, doi:10.1002/ldr.2147, 2012.
- Royall, D.: Use of mineral magnetic measurements to investigate soil erosion and sediment delivery in a small agricultural catchment in limestone terrain, *Catena*, 46, 15–34, 2001.
- Sidle, R. C., Kitahara, H., and Temjima, T.: Experimental studies on the effects of pipe flow on through flow partitioning, *J. Hydrol.*, 16, 207–219, 1995.

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Sweeting, M. M.: Reflections on the development of Karst geomorphology in Europe and a comparison with its development in China, *Z. Geomorphol.*, 37, 127–138, 1993.
- Tian, F., Wang, Z., Niu, Z., Ma, J., and Wu, H.: Experimental research on soil erosion process in Loess hill slope, *Agricultural Research in the Arid Areas*, 23, 141–146, 2005.
- 5 Timothy, A. Q., Gerarel, G., Jean, P., Jeroshuer, H., and Peter, K.: Fine earth translocation by tillage in stony soils in the Guadalentin southeast Spain, an investigation using Caesium-137, *Soil Till. Res.*, 51, 279–301, 1999.
- Wang, H., Xiong, K., and Liu, Y.: Mechanism research of soil and water loss underground in karst region, *Soil and Water Conservation in China*, 8, 11–15, 2009.
- 10 Wang, Z., Wang, Y., Huang, X., Wan, X. H., and Liu, Q. S.: Soil erosion process research of the loess bare slope, *Research of Soil and Water Conservation*, 11, 84–87, 2004.
- Wu, S., Zhu, W., Su, W., Liu, T. H., and Li, X. H.: Study on soil erosion and nutrient loss positioning in karst regions, *Garsologica Sinica*, 24, 302–502, 2005.
- Zhang, H., Wang, Y., Bei, Y., Cheng, Y., Shi, Y., Sheng, Q., Yang, M., and Chang, D.: A study on pipe flow on the slope of granite region of the Three Gorges Area of Yangtze River, *Journal of Beijing Forestry University*, 22, 53–57, 2000.
- 15 Zhang, X., Jiao, J., He, X., Wu, S. F., and Li, J.: Soil loss tolerance and reasonable soil loss, *Science of Soil and Water Conservation*, 5, 114–116, 2007.
- Zhang, X., Wang, S., and Cao, J.: Mass balance of silicate minerals in soils and soil losses in the karst mountainous regions of Southwest China, *Earth and Environment*, 37, 97–102, 2009.
- 20 Zhang, Y., Xiong, K., An, Y., Liang, H. T., and Wu, K. M.: Soil erosion of Huajiang demonstrating area in karst gorge region, *Bulletin of Soil and Water Conservation*, 23, 19–22, 2003.
- Zhang, Z., Fu, W., Zhang, H., Xiao, J. H., and Ma, K.: Study on soil erosion of different degrees in karst region by using cesium-137 technique, *J. Mt. Sci.*, 25, 302–308, 2007.
- 25 Zhao, G., Mu, X., Wen, Z., Wang, F., and Gao, P.: Soil erosion, conservation, and Eco-environment changes in the Loess Plateau of China, *Land Degrad. Dev.*, 24, 499–510, doi:10.1002/ldr.2246, 2013.
- Zhou, N., Li, C., Jiang, S., Liu, G. M., and Long, X. H.: Models of soil and water loss and soil leakage in puding karst area, *Bulletin of Soil and Water Conservation*, 29, 7–11, 2009.
- 30 Zhu, X., Zhang, L., Fang, J., Zhao, Y. G., and Xiao, P. Q.: Research on simulated rainfall experiments of sediment yield in the processes of soil water erosion on sloping field, *B. Sci. Technol. Soc.*, 25, 680–683, 2009.

Ziadat, F. M. and Taimah, A. Y.: Effect of rainfall intensity, slope and land use and antecedent soil moisture on soil erosion in an arid environment, Land Degrad. Dev., 24, 582–590, doi:10.1002/ldr.2239, 2013.

SED

7, 1639–1671, 2015

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



SED

7, 1639–1671, 2015

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Table 1. Soil particle composition.

Soil particle diameter	≥ 0.25 mm	≥ 0.05 mm	≤ 0.05 mm	≤ 0.01 mm	≤ 0.005 mm	≤ 0.001 mm
Content	0.09 %	9.73 %	90.27 %	74.14 %	63.93 %	48.55 %

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Table 2. Rainfall intensity on the impact of runoff and sediment production.

Rainfall intensity (mm h^{-1})	30	50	80	120	150
Surface accumulated runoff amount (L)	47.3	107	255.5	376.5	402
Underground accumulated runoff amount (L)	149.5	226.5	249.5	258.5	289
Surface accumulated bottom load amount (g)	0	0	63.436	99.356	210.048
Surface accumulated suspended load amount (g)	81.3295	214.46	459.455	528.349	1625.87
Underground accumulated suspended load amount (g)	121.524	126.04	217.377	219.027	578.89

Note: in the table, the pore fissure degree is 2 %, the slope gradient is 25°, the rock bareness ratio is 40 %, and the rainfall duration is 90 min.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Table 3. Regression Equation of Accumulated Runoff and Sediment Production and Rainfall Intensity (x).

Indexes	Regression equation	R^2
Surface accumulated runoff amount	$y = 97.89x - 56.01$	0.9591
Surface accumulated bottom load	$y = 13.848x^2 - 31.141x + 15.666$	0.9818
Surface accumulated suspended load	$y = 125.19x^2 - 410.85x + 437.34$	0.9224
Underground accumulated runoff amount	$y = 31.1x + 141.3$	0.8745
Underground accumulated suspended load	$y = 44.358x^2 - 165.37x + 260.76$	0.9089

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Table 4. Degrees of holes and fissures on the impact of runoff and sediment production.

Underground pore fissure degree		Rainfall intensity (mm h^{-1})				
		30	50	80	120	150
1 %	Underground accumulated runoff amount (L)	68.1	97	112	126.5	139.5
	Surface accumulated runoff amount (L)	188.5	285	523	705.5	758.5
	Underground accumulated suspended load amount (g)	31.3	45.176	102.7	136.3	155.3
	Surface accumulated bottom load amount (g)	7.227	26.82	675.34	933.25	1033
	Surface accumulated suspended load amount (g)	206.98	295.02	1699.44	1769.3	1799.
2 %	Underground accumulated runoff amount (L)	80.5	112	131.5	205	222
	Surface accumulated runoff amount (L)	149.5	247.5	509	587	685
	Underground accumulated suspended load amount (g)	32.417	50.593	107.56	141.32	191.5
	Surface accumulated bottom load amount (g)	3.114	22.04	446.44	557.1	627.8
	Surface accumulated suspended load amount (g)	178.6	265.00	1440.15	1531.6	1640.
3 %	Underground accumulated runoff amount (L)	95	126.5	215.5	255	277
	Surface accumulated runoff amount (L)	143.5	222.5	401	585.5	629.5
	Underground accumulated suspended load amount (g)	33.94	92.948	578.89	583.97	632.2
	Surface accumulated bottom load amount (g)	0	18.99	393.3	507.8	596.1
	Surface accumulated suspended load amount (g)	107	214.46	1125.87	1377.9	1425
4 %	Underground accumulated runoff amount (L)	98	126.5	272	280.5	293
	Surface accumulated runoff amount (L)	118.5	206.5	379	509	598
	Underground accumulated suspended load amount (g)	62.512	101.39	592.22	635.75	678.9
	Surface accumulated bottom load amount (g)	0	17.66	393.24	447	486.5
	Surface accumulated suspended load amount (g)	97	138.52	991.17	1011.2	1190.6
5 %	Underground accumulated runoff amount (L)	119.5	253.5	295	302.5	345.2
	Surface accumulated runoff amount (L)	98	132.5	340.5	481.2	544
	Underground accumulated suspended load amount (g)	67.363	109.36	618.89	670.80	698.9
	Surface accumulated bottom load amount (g)	0	5.07	316.15	368.5	426.5
	Surface accumulated suspended load amount (g)	88	115.349	158.22	160.5	730.6

Note: rock bareness ratio is 30 %, the slope gradient is 25° and the rainfall duration is 90 min.

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Table 5. Regression equation of accumulated runoff and sediment production and underground pore fissure degree (x).

Indexes	Regression equation	R^2
Surface accumulated runoff amount	$y = -52.66x + 731.62$	0.9113
Surface accumulated bottom load	$y = -123.96x + 934.61$	0.8026
Surface accumulated suspended load	$y = -373.8x + 2291.5$	0.8858
Underground accumulated runoff amount	$y = 42.75x + 105.65$	0.928
Underground accumulated suspended load	$y = 156.34x - 35.399$	0.8327

Note: the results in the table are obtained by taking rainfall data being 120 mm h^{-1} as an example.

SED

7, 1639–1671, 2015

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion





Figure 1. Geographic situation of the study area in China.



Holes at bottom of tank



Figure 2. Image of steel tank.

SED

7, 1639–1671, 2015

Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.

Title Page	
Abstract	Introduction
Conclusions	References
Tables	Figures
◀	▶
◀	▶
Back	Close
Full Screen / Esc	
Printer-friendly Version	
Interactive Discussion	



Karst bare slope soil erosion and soil quality: a simulation case study

Q. Dai et al.




Figure 3. Variation of runoff and sediment production with rainfall duration under 30 % in pore fissure degree, degrees of holes and fissures with 3 %, bedrock rate with 50 mm h^{-1} and 25° in slope.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

