1 Title page

2 Back to the future? Conservative grassland management can

3 preserve soil health in the changing landscapes of Uruguay

- 4 Ina Säumel¹, Leonardo R. Ramírez¹, Sarah Tietjen², Marcos Barra³ and Erick Zagal⁴
- 5 ¹Integrative Research Institute THESys Transformation of Human-Environment-Systems
- 6 Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, Berlin, 10099, Germany.
- 7 ² Leibniz Institute of Vegetable and Ornamental Crops (IGZ) e.V., Theodor-Echtermeyer-Weg
- 8 1, 14979 Großbeeren, Germany
- 9 ³ Städtisches Klinikum Dessau, Auenweg 38, 06847 Dessau-Roßlau, Germany
- 10 ⁴ Departamento de Suelos y Recursos Naturales, Universidad de Concepción, Campus Chillán,
- 11 Vicente Méndez 595, Chillán, Chile
- 12 Correspondence to: Ina Säumel (ina.saeumel@hu-berlin.de)

13 Abstract. The 'soils of the anthropocene' are predominately agricultural. To understand them,

- 14 we analysed agri- and silvicultural intensification of Uruguayan grasslands in a country wide
- 15 survey on fertility proxies, pH and trace metals in topsoils originating from different land uses
- 16 across the whole country. Thus, our results reflect interactions of both the natural diversity of
- 17 the Uruguayan soil formation and impacts of land use change. We observed a loss of nutrients,
- 18 trace metals and organic matter from grassland, crops and timber plantations. As an example,
- 19 the cation exchange capacity was 160 percent higher in native forests compared to grasslands
- 20 and lowest in timber plantations, reaching only half of the CEC in grasslands. Acidification of
- 21 topsoils continues as three fourth of all samples are 'extremely acidic' and 'very strongly acidic',
- 22 Topsoils of riverine forests accumulate more trace metals compared to the other uses. We

hat gelöscht: a

hat gelöscht: and lowest in timber plantations

25 assume an accumulation in the topsoils of riverine forests, where high levels of nutrients, trace 26 metals and organic carbon are found. The translocation of nutrients and organic matter across 27 the landscape to the erosion base depends on local land use trajectories. Increasing soil 28 acidification is driving a positive feedback loop, and land use intensification is leading to 29 degradation of local black soils within a few decades. Our data raises questions about the 30 resilience and carrying capacity of Uruguayan soils with regard to currently implemented 31 highly productive management forms, including the use of timber plantation for carbon 32 sequestration, and supports more conservative forms of extensive management on the grassland 33 biome.

34 1. Introduction

35 Human activities alter the bio- and pedosphere, leaving a footprint of such a magnitude that it 36 can be verified stratigraphically (Waters et al., 2016). This unprecedented transformational 37 force is intimately related to the expansion of societies and its productive frontiers, causing a 38 loss of biodiversity, habitat and soil degradation and, consequently, to ecosystem modification 39 (Foley et al., 2005, Borrelli et al., 2017). In this context, soil sciences have transitioned from 40 studies on natural soil formation to the science of 'anthropedogenesis' (Richter, 2020), 41 focussing on the 'soils of the anthropocene' that are predominately agricultural (51 Million 42 km²) or urban (1.5 Million km²; FAO, 2019). 43 The temperate grasslands of South America have historically been characterised by rolling 44 plains and low hills that have been extensively exploited for cattle production and its 45 derivatives since the arrival of European colonization. The Río de la Plata grasslands are one 46 of our planet's four major black soil regions (Durán et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2012), and some of 47 the most fertile soils in the world. Playing an important role in the global food production, these 48 are characterized by a thick, humus and base cation rich and a high cation exchange capacity

hat gelöscht: Mio.

hat gelöscht: Mio

51 throughout their profile. Maintaining their properties are therefore crucial to developing 52 sustainable and productive agriculture (Durán et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2012).

53 Today, the 'Uruguayan savanna' is part of the top-three most critically endangered biomes 54 (Veldman et al., 2015). In recent decades, however, the grassland has decreased due to the 55 expansion of cash crops and Eucalyptus plantations, both of which are promoted by national 56 legislation including land grabbing and trans-nationalization (Piñeiro, 2012). This land use 57 intensification, with its increased input of energy, nutrients and pesticides, leads to an overall 58 loss of soil fertility and increasing toxicity related to acidification, salinization and 59 contaminants (Liu et al., 2012; Borrelli et al., 2017). Ecological, economic and cultural 60 functions of soils are severely degraded, and the degradation of black soils in South America 61 is of particular concern because they have only been heavily exploited for a comparatively 62 short period of time (Durán et al., 2011).

63 Since the first decades of the twentieth-century, compared to other disciplines, soil sciences 64 have received an extraordinary amount of attention in Uruguayan academia, governance, the

65 productive sector, and also in the general public, resulting in a national soil inventory program

66 in 1965. The subsequent classification of Uruguayan soils and their productivity (CONEAT

67 Index) remains an important source for today's land taxation and for management plans by the

68 legal conservation regulations, and provides a detailed classification that takes into account soil

69 type, texture, natural vegetation, altitude and geology (Lanfranco and Sapriza, 2011).

As soil degradation is extremely relevant for countries like Uruguay, which are socioeconomically dependent on their soils (Zubriggen et al. 2020), it is a topic of discussion for local farmers, academia, and the public. An actualization of the state of the art of soils and related processes is needed (García-Préchac et al. 2004; De Faccio et al. 2021), particularly as there has been little study of the impacts of the Uruguayan grassland intensification on soils properties (Beretta-Blanco et al., 2019). At the same time, while a new paradigm for grassland intensification with a wide set of means including fertilization has been proposed to increase 77 economic and environmental sustainability (Jaurena et al., 2021), it is urgent to get more

78 insights into the dynamics of nutrients in soils of Uruguay and their availability for crops

79 (Beretta-Blanco et al., 2019).

80 Soil classifications are mainly based on subsoils. However, we focus on topsoil as the most

81 relevant and very responsive interface for ecological processes and farmer's management.
82 Understanding the state of the art of topsoils and its processes is crucial for developing
83 recommendations for sustainable land management practices. Due to the diversity of
84 perspectives on soil quality and health and related ecosystem services, operational procedures

85 for evaluation of soil functioning are still lacking (Bonfante et al. 2021). We contribute to a

86 better understanding of globally occurring degradation processes among often conflicting goals

87 <u>such as desired soil productivity, yield limits, especially in erosion sensitive soils, and</u>
88 necessary soil conservation.

89 We therefore explored soil parameters describing current chemical conditions of topsoils that

90 are parts of different soil groups and orders, and Uruguayan soil categories. Specifically, in

91 order to explore the gains and losses of macro and micro-nutrients and soil organic carbon

92 across landscapes, and to determine the impact of land use change on acidification and trace

93 metal presence and related trade-offs with soil degradation and conservation. In detail we

94 address the following question: how do fertility proxies such as soil organic carbon and content

95 of nutrients, acidification (pH) and trace metals accumulation in topsoils vary across different

96 land uses (i.e. comparing grassland, timber plantation, native forest, and agricultural land)?

97 Thus, we expand the knowledge across land uses from more natural to strongly modified uses

98 and discuss the results in light of different degradation processes such as erosion, depletion of

99 nutrients or carbon, acidification and accumulation of pollutants and in the light on current

100 debates on intensification.

hat gelöscht: ,

hat gelöscht: since u

hat gelöscht: in

hat gelöscht: the field of tension hat gelöscht: between

hat gelöscht: mobility

hat gelöscht: i)

108 2. Material and Methods

109 2.1 Study area and design

110 Uruguay covers about 176,000 km², and has a population of 3.5 Million, mainly in urban areas.

111 The Western half of Uruguay is dominated by Mollisols, developed on a wide range of

112 sediments from the Devonian to the Cenozoic era (partially associated with Vertisols), while

113 the Eastern plains and wetlands have, in addition to Mollisols, other soil types on the slopes,

114 rocks and on flood plans (i.e. Alfisols, Ultisols, Entisols and Inceptisols; Durán et al. 2011).

115 During a country-wide survey from December 2015 to March 2016, we collected 280 topsoil 116 samples of 0-10 cm depth from 101 plots (50x50m in grassland and crops; 100x100m in native 117 forests and timber plantations) distributed at 28 monitoring sites throughout Uruguay, South 118 America (Fig. 1a-b; Table 1), using a stratified random design. In the first step, we randomly 119 selected monitoring sites across the country. In the second step, we contacted landowners to 120 explore their willingness to establish a long-term monitoring site. If the owner agreed, plot 121 selection was stratified by different rural land use types: grassland, timber plantations of *Pinus* 122 and Eucalyptus species, native forest, and crops. Native forests cover mainly riverine and park 123 forests. The later are a savanna like transition zones between riverine forests and the open 124 grasslands. We subdivided grassland plots according to the intensity of use: (i) undisturbed 125 grassland (without grazing), (ii) partially grazed grasslands (with sporadic grazing and low animal charge), and (iii) highly grazed grassland (with high animal charge). Land use change 126 127 from 1986 to 2017 follows basically three different trajectories: i) the expansion of timber 128 plantations over grassland leading to a disaggregation of grassland by timber plantations; ii)

129 cropland expansion where crop cover maintains the open landscape character of former 130 grasslands, grassland conservation where large and regularly interconnected riverine forests in

grasslands, grassland conservation where large and regularly interconnected riverine forests in a landscape dominated by grasslands (Ramírez and Säumel 2021) and grassland intensification hat gelöscht: m

133 changing from natural grassland to so called 'improved' or artificial grasslands (Modernel et

al. 2016; Jaurena et al. 2021). Fertilization and application of other agrochemicals is standard

135 procedure in timber plantations, artificial grasslands and industrial crops. We sampled top soil

136 three times at each land use at the edges of the plot, and stored samples below 7°C until

137 laboratory processing. <u>The plots are placed in homogenous areas to avoid edge effects.</u>

138 2.2 Analysis of Soil Samples

139 For gravimetric determination of soil moisture, the topsoils samples were dried at 105 °C until

140 constant weight. Next, lumps in the samples were broken down and the remaining plant

141 material was removed before sieving (2 mm) and ground.

142 We analysed 280 samples regarding macronutrients, pH and trace metals and 80 samples for

143 soluble cations and micronutrients (Table 1; Sadzawka et al. 2006; Zagal & Sadzawka 2007).

144 Among fertility-related variables, we measured the total amount of the macronutrients

145 phosphorus (P), organic carbon (SOC) and nitrogen (N), so obtaining the C/N ratio. To

146 determine total carbon and nitrogen, the samples were sieved again (0.5 mm) and analyzed

147 using dry combustion with a LECO TruSpec CN (USA) at a combustion temperature of 950

148 °C with ultra-pure oxygen. In addition, the presence of <u>carbonates was</u> tested for by adding

- 149 concentrated hydrochloric acid, which was negative for all soil samples analysed.
- 150 We determined concentrations of the soluble cations calcium (Ca²⁺), magnesium (Mg²⁺),
- 151 potassium (K_{\pm}^{\pm}), sodium (N a_{\pm}^{\pm}), and the micronutrients copper (C u_{\pm}^{2+}), zinc (Z n_{\pm}^{2+}), manganese
- 152 (Mn_{k}^{2+}) and iron $(Fe_{k}^{2+/3+})$ by atomic spectroscopy (Unicam AAS Solaar 969, Thermo Electron
- 153 Corporation, USA), extracting with ammonium acetate (1 mol l⁻¹, pH 7), and with DTPA-
- 154 CaCl₂-TEA at (pH 7.3). We calculated the cation-exchange capacity (CEC). Acidity was
- 155 measured by adding calcium chloride (0.01M) to the samples in a 2.5:1 proportion, and after

156 shaking and two hours rest, read with a pH meter (HI2550 meter, Hanna Instruments, USA)).

(hat gelöscht: SOC
(hat gelöscht: was
(hat gelöscht: the presence of carbonates was
(hat gelöscht: assessed to obtain the amount of SOC.
~(hat formatiert: Hochgestellt
Y	hat formatiert: Hochgestellt
\geq	hat formatiert: Hochgestellt
) (hat formatiert: Hochgestellt
$\langle \rangle$	hat formatiert: Hochgestellt
(Ì	hat formatiert: Hochgestellt
$\langle \rangle$	hat formatiert: Hochgestellt
//	hat formatiert: Hochgestellt
Y	hat formatiert: Hochgestellt

- 161 For these variables, each tenth sample was duplicated. We categorized acidity using the USDA
- 162 Natural Resources Conservation Service classification (Kellogg, 1993).
- 163 To determine the concentrations of arsenic (As), cadmium (Cd), chromium (Cr) and lead (Pb),
- 164 samples were further sieved as before (0.5 mm), weighed out into a digesting container, and

165 extracted with a mixture of nitric acid (70%) and hydrochloric acid (30%) in a 1:3 proportion.

- 166 The digestion took place in a Titan MPS (Perkin Elmer, USA) microwave at a programme
- 167 suitable for this digestion (Method 3051A). During the proceedings, only deionized water Type
- 168 I ASTM1193 (EC max 0.06 to 0.1 μS/cm) was used. Reagents were used to eliminate traces of
- 169 other materials and to avoid contamination of the samples. The trace metals were determined
- 170 by inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectroscopy using the Optima 8000 (Perkin
- 171 Elmer) with metal-associated wavelengths of 193.696 nm for As, 228.802 nm for Cd, 267.716
- 172 nm for Cr and 220.353 nm for Pb.
- 173 Total P concentration of phosphorus was determined calorimetrically after microwave-assisted
- 174 digestion with Unicam spectrometer at a wavelength of 660 nm. For all these variables, a
- 175 repetition for each round of the microwave digestion was made.

176 **2.3 Soil classification**

We intersected the coordinates of the centre of the plots with maps containing geospatialinformation on the classification of the Uruguayan soils using ArcGIS 10.3 (ESRI, 2018). For

179 Soil Groups classification, we used the of the World Reference Base for Soil Resources (WRB;

- 180 IUSS Working Group, 2015); for Soil Orders, the USDA soil taxonomy (Soil Survey Staff,
- 181 1999); and for the local Uruguayan classification, Soil CONEAT (Comisión Nacional de
- 182 Estudio Agronómico de la Tierra) Groups categories, which include productive capacity of
- 183 cattle and sheep (MGAP, 2020). The CONEAT groups are defined by their productive capacity
- 184 in terms of beef, sheep and wool expressed by an index relative to the average productive

185 capacity of the country, to which the index 100 corresponds. The classification is based on 186 photo-interpretation at a scale of 1:40,000, field verifications and physico-chemical analysis of 187 the soils. The productivity indices correspond to soil groups. The CONEAT groups have been 188 defined by the dominant and associated soils according to the Soil Classification of Uruguay. 189 The groups are related to the units of the Soil Reconnaissance Chart of Uruguay at a scale of 190 1:1,000,000. For each group, some important soil properties and associated landscape 191 characteristics are indicated. The nomenclature of the CONEAT groups correlates with the Soil 192 Use and Management Zones of Uruguay. The Soil Groups are superimposed on the rural parcel 193 and are represented in the CONEAT cartography at a scale of 1:20,000 (for more details see 194 MGAP, 2020).

195 2.4 Data Analysis

196 In a first step, we explored and prepared our database for further analysis. Exploring the 197 distribution of the soil parameters in R (R Core Team 2021), ruled out the normality of the data 198 using the Shapiro-Wilk Test and the homogeneity of variances with the Fligner-Killeen Test. 199 We tested for outliers using the 1.5-3 IOR threshold and the function *outlierTest* from the R 200 package car (Fox and Weisberg 2019), reviewing the flagged observations case by case in the 201 experimental context. The outliers were removed (Supplementary Material: Fig.S2). The 202 variables on soils characteristics showed generally positive skewed distributions, in some cases 203 multimodal, and tests showed evidence contrary to assumptions of spatial autocorrelation, 204 homoscedasticity and normality in most cases (Supplementary Material: Table S1-S2; Fig. S1-205 S2).

206 Spearman's rank correlations (ρ) were calculated to explore linear associations between soil 207 parameters across all single samples and within different land uses. We used the *adonis* 208 function of the R package *vegan v2.5-7* (Oksanen et al., 2020) with a Euclidean dissimilarity 209 matrix from our normalized soil data to perform PERMANOVA tests with 9999 permutations

210 to analyse the multivariate homogeneity of group dispersions based on differences on soil

211 parameters between land uses.

212 To compare the general effects of land use type on topsoil parameters, non-parametric Kruskal-

213 Wallis tests were carried out in R. When significant ($p \le 0.05$), we used Pairwise Wilcoxon

Rank Sum tests with Benjamini & Hochberg correction (1995) to evaluate pairwise differences
among land uses.

We used non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) as a robust unconstrained ordination method to visualize patterns of top soil characteristics among all samples and within subsamples (intersected with different soil Orders) across different land uses using the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity matrix. The matrix was constructed with the *vegan* package to depict patterns of all soil parameters in two dimensions (Fig.3a, c-f) and for the dataset without soluble cations and micronutrients variables comparing subcategories within single land use types (i.e. within grasslands in 'undisturbed', 'partially grazed' and 'highly grazed' plots; timber

223 plantations in 'Eucalyptus' or 'Pinus' plots; Fig. 3b).

224 **3. Results**

225 Nearly 75% of the sampled 101 plots intersected with the soil Group category 'Luvic Phaeozem' 226 (WRB; IUSS Working Group, 2015). A quarter of our plots were distributed among four other 227 Groups (i.e. Haplic Luvisols, Eutric Vertisols, Planosols, Lithic Leptisols; Fig. 1c). Half of our 228 plots intersected with the Orders 'Argiudolls' or 'Argiudolls & Hapluderts' (Soil Survey Staff, 229 1999), and about a quarter with 'Hapludalfs & Hapludults' or 'Argiudolls, Hapludolls & 230 Hapludalfs' (Fig. 1d). Our plots intersected with 32 different CONEAT categories (MGAP, 231 2021). The most frequent categories were '10.2', '9.3' and '2.12' (25% of our plots) and another 232 quarter with '9.1', '8.8', '9.6' and 'G03.11' (Fig. 1e).

hat formatiert: Nicht Hervorheben

233 **3.1 General characteristics of Uruguayan topsoils**

234 The measured topsoil parameters vary widely across Uruguay, between the different land uses 235 and classification to different soil orders (Table 1, Table A1-A4). The soil organic carbon in 236 topsoils ranged between 0.8 to 16 percent, and was highest in native forests and lowest in timber 237 plantations. The mean of the C/N ratio was about 13, and lowest in crop soils. Phosphorous ranged between 43 to 1009 mg kg-1. We also observed a high variability for the micro- and 238 239 macronutrients and trace metals. The average cation-exchange capacity (CEC) was 12.41 cmol 240 kg⁻¹, highest in topsoils of native forest, followed by crops and grasslands and timber 241 plantations (Table 1, Table A1-A2). 242 For the whole data set, high correlation was found between P with SOC and Zn (ρ =0.82 and

- For the whole data set, high correlation was found between 1 with SOC and $\Sigma h (p=0.82$ and
- 243 0.76, respectively), and between Mg with Ca and Na (ρ =0.82 and 0.76, respectively; Fig. 2).
- 244 Similar results were observed within particular land uses, although in native forests, a negative
- 245 moderate correlation between Ca and Fe was observed (Fig. S3). There was high correlation
- 246 between pH and Ca (ρ =0.89; Fig. 2). In native forests, we also found similar correlation with
- 247 other soluble cations like Mg and K (Fig. S3). In park forests topsoils, there was a negative
- 248 correlation between pH and As and Pb (ρ =-0.81 and ρ =-0.84, respectively). In highly grazed
- 249 pastures and crops pH was highly correlated with Cr, and in crops also with As (ρ =0.93; Fig.
- 250 S3). Among trace metals, Spearman correlation was moderate between As with Cr and Pb and
- 251 high between Cr and Pb (Fig. 2). These correlation trends increased in grasslands, timber
- 252 plantations and crops. We also found a high correlation between cadmium and Cr in crops
- 253 (ρ =0.81). Phosphorus was highly correlated with Cr and As in pine plantations, while in
- soybean crops the correlation was between phosphorus with Cr and Pb (Fig. S3).

255 **3.2 Topsoil characteristics clustered by land use**

- 256 We found differences in multivariate distribution of samples according to the different land
- 257 uses (i.e., grassland, timber plantations or native forests; Fig. 3a-f; Table S3-S8). All pairwise

258 comparison of land uses showed significant differences with all variables (p=0.0001; Fig. 3a; 259 Table S3). We analysed subcategories within a land use type using the dataset without soluble 260 cations and micronutrients variables, only finding significant differences between Eucalyptus 261 and *Pinus* stands (p=0.0001; Fig. 3b; Table S4) but not among different grassland subtypes. 262 We also found differences analysing subsamples of different soil order classification to the 263 different land uses (Fig. 3c-f; Table S5-S8). The samples intersected with 'Argiudolls' included 264 all plots on crops, and we found significant differences in all pairwise comparisons of land uses 265 except between grasslands and timber plantation (p=0.0004; Fig. 3c; Table S5). We further 266 found differences between timber plantations and native forests at soils of the 'Argiudolls & 267 Hapluderts' Orders (p=0.0009; Fig. 3d; Table S6) and between timber plantations and 268 grasslands or native forests in soils of the 'Argiudolls, Hapudolls & Hapludalf' Orders 269 (p=0.0284; Fig. 3e; Table S7). Results for samples in 'Hapludalfs & Hapludults' soils were 270 similar to those obtained at country scale (p=0.0001; Fig. 3f; Table S8).

271 **3.3 Differences in fertility proxies**

We found significantly higher fertility proxies for SOC, P, Ca, Mg and Zn in topsoils from native forests compared to grasslands and timber plantations (Fig. 4b-e, h). Phosphorous was

274 significantly higher in topsoils of grassland compared to those of timber plantations (Fig. 4c).

275 Potassium was significantly higher in topsoils of native forests compared to timber plantations

276 (Fig. 4f). At subcategories level, we found significantly higher amounts of K in partially used

277 grasslands in comparison to samples from highly grazed pastures, and higher SOC (p=0.002),

278 P (p=0.059), Na (p=0.043), K (p=0.012) and Zn (p=0.048) in Eucalyptus compared to Pinus

279 plantations (Fig. S4). Among native forests, samples from riverine forests contain more Mg

280 (p=0.023) and Na (p=0.023) in comparison to park forests.

281 Considering all samples within the Order 'Argiudolls', C/N ratio in agricultural topsoils are

282 lower compared to all other land uses. Phosphorus was higher in topsoils of native forests and

283 crops compared to grasslands and timber plantations. Soil organic carbon was highest in native

284 forests (Fig. 5a-o; Table A3-A4).

285 3.4 Soil Acidification

286 Topsoil samples showed a markedly acid profile (median pH=4.66), with nearly 75% classified 287 as 'extremely acidic' and 'very strongly acidic' (Fig. 6a). We found significant differences across 288 land uses, with less acidic native forests, and lower pH in timber plantations (Fig. 6b). 289 Comparing between land uses, we found more samples with neutral acidity in grasslands and 290 more with higher acidity in timber plantations (Fig. 6b-c). In addition, we found lower pH in 291 samples from Pinus compared to Eucalyptus stands (p=0.018). Results of analysis inside soil 292 Orders showed similar variations observed at country scale, with timber plantations being more 293 acid and native forest closer to neutral pH (Fig. 6d-f).

294 **3.5 Trace metal accumulation across land uses**

For As, Cd, Cr and Pb, we found significantly higher concentrations in topsoils originating from native forests compared to the grassland and timber plantation samples (Fig. 4l-o and 5lo; Table A1-A4). At the same time, samples from *Eucalyptus* plantations had higher concentrations of both Cr (p<0.005) and Pb (p<0.005) than *Pinus* topsoils, while the same was observed for Cr (p<0.001) and Pb (p<0.05) in riverine forests compared to park forests (Fig. S5).

301 4. Discussion

The vicious circle between the wish to stop soil degradation and concurrent increases in land productivity to satisfy the increasing demand for food, fibres and energy has not been broken since green revolution. Socio-economic and conventional management practices that drive soil degradation have generated several traps, such as the 'inputs trap' where a reduced yield per 306 area is followed by higher fertilizer application or the 'credit or poverty trap' where economic 307 pressure forces the farmer to intensification (Gomiero, 2016). Caught in this loop, the soils of 308 the temperate grasslands of Uruguay have suffered strong degradation from erosion, 309 acidification, contamination, salinification and compaction (Zurbriggen et al., 2020). This is 310 clearly reflected in the results of our topsoil survey, which also adds interesting insights from 311 timber plantations, grasslands and native forests to an existing database consisting mainly of 312 crops and pastures samples from 2002-2014, which demonstrated the loss of organic matter by 313 25% and an increasing loss of nutrients (Beretta-Blanco et al. 2019). We contribute deeper 314 insights on fertility, acidification and trace metals accumulation in topsoils from a wide range 315 of different land uses, which is, to our knowledge, unique for the region since the CONEAT 316 classification (CONEAT Index, 1976).

317

318 4.1 Translocation of elements in topsoils within landscape

319 Our data demonstrate the high amounts of organic carbon, nutrients and trace metals in topsoil 320 samples from riverine forests, suggesting transport of soil particles from the surrounding land 321 uses (e.g., grasslands, crop or timber plantations) to the borders of rivers, streams and creeks. 322 Therefore, we assume that organic carbon, nutrients and trace metals are displaced within the 323 landscape and accumulate in the floodplains. Regional soil erosion models estimate the loss of 324 2-5 tons ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ for a third of the country depending on precipitation, topography, soil 325 erodibility and land management (Carrasco-Letelier and Beretta-Blanco 2017). One possible 326 direct impact is the increasing eutrophication reported for larger local rivers, although the 327 models used by these authors did not link Chlorophyll-a concentrations with agricultural land 328 use (Beretta-Blanco and Carrasco-Letelier 2021 and replies). However, other vertical processes 329 and differences across land uses can be hidden deeper in the soil profile, and have not been 330 analysed in this study.

331 Organic carbon content and the exchangeable cations are strongly reduced in topsoils of 332 grasslands, timber plantations and crops compared to native forests (Fig. 4b, d-h and 5b, d-h). 333 Of all the fertility proxies assessed, phosphorus in topsoil was most significantly affected by 334 different land uses, being highest in native forests (Fig. 4c and 5c). The cation exchange 335 capacity (CEC) was highest in native forests (more than 160 percent of the CEC in grasslands) 336 and lowest in timber plantations, reaching only half of the CEC in grasslands (Table A1-A2). 337 Lower average nutrient concentrations and corresponding CEC reported for two timber 338 plantations in the East and one in the Norwest of Uruguay (Hernández et al., 2009 and 2016; 339 Céspedes-Payret et al., 2012) may result from a combined effect of topsoil degradation in 340 timber plantations due to management practices and to soil texture (Sandoval-Lopez et al., 341 2020). The trees' uptake and the general export of nutrients from fast growing timber 342 plantations through harvesting is higher than the natural input into those systems (Merino et 343 al., 2005). This effect is particularly relevant because timber plantations in Uruguay are on 344 'forestry priority soils', which are generally soils with low fertility, superficial to moderate 345 depth and good drainage (OAS, 1994), so afforestation might reduce even more their soil 346 fertility.

347 Comparing neighbouring sites of grassland and afforested grasslands, our data set shows no 348 significant depletion of nutrients by timber plantations (p=0.208) but a slightly higher average 349 of CEC at grasslands (Table A1). In general, plants are expected to compensate the extraction 350 of cations from upper soil by the 'uplift of nutrient' from deeper horizons (Jobbagy and Jackson, 351 2004). This has been questioned for *Eucalvptus* plantations on sandy soils, where, for example, 352 an increase of potassium in the topsoil was not observed compared to the neighbouring 353 grassland (Céspedes-Payret et al., 2012). Phosphorous and cations decline with sand content, 354 so physicochemical factors such as the percentage of sand and organic matter, influence soil 355 fertility (Sandoval-Lopez et al., 2020). A study of Eucalyptus plantations in South-East Brazil 356 did not show a significant depletion of nutrients and carbon; in contrast, carbon, potassium and calcium increased in the topsoil after twelve years over one or two harvest and fertilization
cycles (McMahon et al., 2019). To sum up, the patterns observed in the various sites in our
survey and the other studies indicate very complex interactions of numerous factors. Removal
of nutrients by high-yield timber plantations may exceed the capacity of nutrient exchange or
turnover of forest litter and wastes. Both stand management and environmental conditions (e.g.,
precipitation) influence nutrient and carbon stocks (McMahon et al., 2019; Sandoval-Lopez et
al., 2020).

364 The C/N ratio in topsoils ranged within values reported for grassland and timber plantations of 365 the region (see Berthrong et al., 2012). In contrast to that study, however, we observed no 366 differences between grassland and timber plantations (Fig. 4a), but between topsoils of timber 367 plantations, native forests and crops (Fig. 5a). Organic matter and nitrogen decrease in topsoils 368 after grassland afforestation (Berthrong et al., 2009) and C/N ratio increases with plantation 369 age and decreases with precipitation (Berthrong et al., 2012). The topsoils of timber plantations 370 have, on average, lower N concentrations compared to other land uses (Table A2) and data in 371 literature (Jobbagy and Jackson 2003).

372 Although in cropland, nutrients are regularly compensated for by increased application of 373 fertilizers (Beretta-Blanco et al., 2019), timber plantations are usually fertilized only in the first 374 year of planting (e.g., Binkley et al., 2017; Sandoval-Lopez et al., 2020). The CEC and the average ratio between $K^+(Ca^{2+}+Mg^{2+})^{-1/2}$ in crops and grasslands are in the ranges reported by 375 376 Beretta-Blanco et al. (2019) with lower availability of potassium for crops. A shortage of 377 potassium and calcium is also most likely for future timber plantations after harvest, especially 378 if the logging process do not include bark stripping on site (Hernández et al., 2009) and due to 379 short time spans between harvest and new planting in the same area (Sandoval-Lopez et al., 380 2020), but see contrasting results of McMahon et al. (2019). The extraction of nutrients and 381 biomass due to grazing (Fernandez et al., 2017), timber (Hernández et al., 2009 and 2016) and 382 crop production (Beretta-Blanco et al., 2019) lowers organic matter content and exchangeable

383 cations, affects the physical, chemical and biological soil properties, and drives degradation.

384 4.2 Acidification in Uruguayan topsoils across land uses

385 A further dimension of the soil degradation directly linked to the cation extraction is the 386 acidification of soils. This has been demonstrated for crops and pastures (Beretta-Blanco et al., 387 2019), and a study site with Eucalyptus (Céspedes-Payret et al., 2012) and is now broadly 388 supported by our topsoil samples originating from a wide range of different land uses across 389 Uruguay. The pH of our topsoil samples are mainly in the category of very strongly to 390 extremely acidic and lowest in timber plantations (Fig. 6), which are below the means reported 391 so far (Jobbagy and Jackson, 2003; Céspedes-Payret et al., 2012). Moreover, as our data on 392 topsoil pH fall short compared to the values estimated by the Food and Agriculture 393 Organization of the United Nations and the Intergovernmental Technical Panel on Soils (Caon 394 and Vargas, 2017), acidification and the deterioration of topsoil quality continues. 395 Acidification results from intensified land uses with nitrogen fertilization, with biological N 396 fixation by the legumes both used in the improved pastures (Modernel et al., 2016), or with 397 cation extraction by crop or timber harvest (Jobbagy and Jackson, 2003). So far, although forest 398 soils tend to be more acidic than agricultural soils due to acid-neutralizing treatments in the 399 latter (Baize and van Oort, 2014), we found no differences between topsoils of crops and native 400 forests (Fig. 6d) as the high organic carbon content in native forests buffers the process to a 401 certain extent.

402 **4.3 Riverine Forest soils as sink for trace metals**

In general, the average concentration of Zn, Cu, Cd, Cr, As and Pb in our topsoils were within
the expected ranges of samples from crops, pastures and grassland in the region (Lavado et al.,
1998, 2004; Roca, 2015). Some samples, especially from orchards and crops, exceeded the
background values of copper, cadmium and arsenic (Table A2; Roca, 2015). Little is known

407 about the pedo-geochemical background of the Pampean soils (Roca, 2015): for example, high 408 arsenic concentration in Uruguayan ground waters has been hypothesized to be due to 409 quaternary ash deposits (Wu et al., 2021). In addition, the lateral heterogeneity of Pampean 410 soils over short distances makes separating geochemical and anthropic signatures difficult 411 (Roca, 2015). However, that the main risk of soil contamination in the region is from the 412 application of fertilizers and agrochemicals is uncontested (Kaushal et al., 2018).

413 To our knowledge, there has been no regional study of trace metals in the native riverine forests 414 or timber plantations. Our work thus expands the evidence base for these land uses. The topsoils 415 of riverine forests accumulate more trace metals compared to those of timber plantations and 416 crops (Fig. 41-o). The higher amount of soil organic matter in riverine forests favours the 417 retention of cations, including trace metals. Although the origin of potentially harmful elements 418 in forest soils have been primarily attributed to atmospheric deposition (Baize and van Oort, 419 2014), atmospheric deposition only plays a major role in vicinity of urban or industrial 420 development, and our data from rural sites suggests a different entry path from the surrounding 421 land uses to the riverine forests. High acidification and low amounts of organic matter reduce 422 the retention of trace metals in the soil of timber plantations, and elements leach out of the soil 423 towards the water table (Baize and van Oort, 2014). The acidification strongly contributes to 424 the overall mobility of base cations into the 'chemical cocktail of the Anthropocene' (Kaushal 425 et al., 2018), including trace metals. We thus observe positive feedback in already impoverished soils with high acidity favouring cations solubility, in addition to the uptake by 426 427 trees intensifies this effect. Timber plantations extract trace metals from soil and also 428 accumulate it in the bark or leaves, so they have been used for phytoremediation (Li et al., 429 2020). This may explain the higher concentration of cadmium in grassland compared to timber 430 plantations (Fig. 4m). Differences between Eucalyptus and Pinus stands may be related to 431 different age classes, as the later may have extracted more lead and chromium from the soil 432 due to their older stand age with rotation periods of about 20 years (Li et al., 2020).

17

hat gelöscht: . hat gelöscht:

435 **4.4 Carbon storage in topsoils of** *Eucalyptus* **plantations**?

Our study provides evidence that the loss of soil organic carbon limits not only the productivity
of the crops, but also potential carbon sequestration in the region (Beretta-Blanco et al., 2019).
Grassland conversion to cropland decreases soil organic carbon storage compared to adjacent
native grasslands (Hernandez-Ramirez et al., 2021).
Afforestation of croplands has been also discussed as a carbon sequestration measure to

441 proactively address and effectively mitigate ongoing climate change within a person's lifetime 442 (Hernandez-Ramirez et al., 2021; Mayer et al. 2020). Although carbon stocks of four 443 Eucalyptus stands in the Brazilian Cerrados increased but did not change in four Eucalyptus 444 stands within the Atlantic Forest (McMahon et al., 2019), this may not be the case for short 445 rotation of Eucalyptus plantation on Campos grasslands. In our topsoil samples originating 446 from 28 different stands across Uruguay, organic carbon is lowest in topsoils of timber 447 plantations (Fig. 4b). Similar amounts have been reported for a timber plantation in the East of 448 Uruguay (Céspedes-Payret et al., 2012), and in North-Eastern Argentine (Sandoval-Lopez et 449 al., 2020). Our data therefore provide clear evidence that rather than contributing to carbon 450 sequestration in the topsoil, the carbon release from the transformation of native grasslands to 451 plantation with these fast-growing species has several adverse effects depending on 452 precipitation and soil type (reviewed by Mayer et al., 2020). 453 Several trade-offs between carbon sequestration through afforestation and local water yield and soil fertility have been demonstrated, including nutrient and soil organic matter depletion,

454 soil fertility have been demonstrated, including nutrient and soil organic matter depletion, 455 acidification, and biodiversity loss and corresponding challenges for landscape conservation 456 (e.g., Jackson et al., 2005; Veldman et al., 2015; Friggens et al., 2020). Soil carbon changes 457 dynamically during the first decade of afforestation. Remaining grassland carbon declines, 458 while tree carbon gain starts (e.g. Paul et al., 2002). Although a net gain of carbon is expected 459 when the new forests approached equilibrium after decades (Hernández-Ramirez et al., 2021),

460 in contrast to long-lasting forests, *Eucalyptus* harvest in Uruguay takes place after less than a

461 decade (appr. 7-10 years). Soil organic carbon does not differ between *Eucalyptus* plantations and neighbouring grasslands (Appendix A; Table A1 and A2). Another study near our sites 12 462 463 and 13 also did not find a significant difference between the soil organic carbon of the upper 464 soil (0-30cm) compared to afforested versus native grasslands (Hernández et al., 2016). A study near our sites 7, 8, 10 reported higher top soil carbon of grassland compared with afforested 465 466 sites in their vicinity only if sand content is lower than sixty percent (Sandoval-Lopez et al., 467 2020). McMahon et al. (2019) identified a greater carbon gain under Eucalyptus stands 468 compared to (potential) carbon losses in neighbouring degraded Cerrado grasslands. There is 469 evidence that the retention of residues after harvest increases the carbon stock in soil (Mayer 470 et al., 2020). Long term monitoring of carbon stocks is needed to verify the influences of 471 management and environmental changes. A regional study on *Eucalyptus* plantations across 472 different biomes in Brazil shows both decreases and no changes depending on precipitation in 473 the dry season, clay content and on the initial stock of carbon in the soil (Cook et al., 2016)

474 The simplistic solution of huge tree plantations to compensate anthropogenic CO_2 emissions 475 has been challenged in the last decade, and some crucial lessons learnt have been summarized 476 (Di Sacco et al., 2020). Since grasslands are more sustainable carbon sinks compared to 477 climate-vulnerable monocultures such as timber plantations (Dass et al. 2018), avoiding 478 afforestation of previously non-forested lands is important. This is the case for Eucalyptus 479 afforestation in the originally forestless grasslands of Uruguay: models on carbon sequestration 480 and dynamics in Mollisols and Oxisols under South American grasslands estimated a higher 481 carbon retention efficiency under grasslands compared to afforested sites, suggesting that 482 silvopastoral systems are a potential solution for soil carbon sequestration in tropical soils 483 (Berhongaray and Alvarez, 2019).

484 Connecting or expanding existing forest and using native species for plantings (Di Sacco et al., 485 2020) is also recommended (see also Alvaro et al. 2020, Ortiz et al. 2020). Our topsoil data 486 indicates that carbon sequestration occurs mainly in the topsoils of native riverine forests that 487 cover less than five percent of the Uruguayan territory. Consequently, the expansion of native

488 forests and the use of native species in forestry project for long term establishment can reduce

489 adverse effects of timber plantations. While there is preliminary evidence that N-fixing tree

490 species can help increase local C stocks of afforestation, because of their potential for invasion,

491 exotic N-fixers should be avoided (Mayer et al. 2020).

492 Recent studies indicated that novel techniques such as perennial grain cropping can help to turn

493 around cropland degradation into beneficial cropland aggradation by using the advantage of

494 perennial vegetation of conserving and even enhancing short term and long-term soil carbon

495 storage and other ecosystems services (Kim et al. 2022).

496 **4.5. Back to more conservative grassland management?**

497 Our soil survey data shows strong soil degradation of Uruguayan black soils from erosion, 498 acidification and contamination, and suggests a translocation of nutrients and organic carbon 499 across the landscape from grassland, timber and crop plantations to the riverine forests. The 500 potential of grasslands as cropland reserve have been largely overestimated (Lambin et al., 501 2013), and they have already degraded during the last decades by inappropriate land 502 management techniques (Jaurena et al., 2021, De Faccio et al., 2021), lack of mainstreaming 503 soil conservative techniques (García-Préchac, 2004; Fernandez et al., 2017), decoupling of crop 504 and livestock (De Faccio et al, 2021) plus climate change impacts with storm water events and 505 drought, all of which trigger soil erosion (Wingever et al. 2015). From the although very limited 506 point of view on topsoils, the concept of conserving 'old growth grasslands' with extensive use 507 (Veldman et al. 2015) appears a more promising strategy to put the 'grasslands at the core' in 508 the Campos region than the use intensification strategies envisioned by Jaurena et al. (2021).

509 5. Conclusions

510 The land use intensification in Uruguay associated with increasing inputs of energy, nutrients 511 and pesticides leads to an overall loss of soil fertility and increasing toxicity related to 512 acidification, salinization and trace metal contaminants. Our data demonstrate the high amounts 513 of organic carbon, nutrients and trace metals in topsoil samples from riverine forests, 514 suggesting transport of soil particles from the surrounding grasslands, crop or timber 515 plantations to the borders of rivers, streams and creeks. Of all the fertility proxies assessed, phosphorus in topsoil was most significantly affected by different land uses, being highest in 516 517 native forests. Cation exchange capacity was also highest in native forests and lowest in timber plantations, where only half that of grasslands was measured. Our study highlights that soil 518 acidification is ongoing and probably also mobilizing trace metals and their accumulation in 519 520 riverine forest topsoils.

521 Data availability

- 522 All data generated or analysed in this study are included in this article (and its supplementary
- 523 materials). Further data are available from the corresponding authors upon reasonable request.

524 Author contributions

IS, LRR, ST and MB conceptualized the study, performed the soil sampling and data analysis.
EZ advised the laboratory analyses. IS wrote the initial draft. LRR, ST, MB and EZ contributed
to generating and reviewing the subsequent versions of the manuscript. IS received the funding
for the study.

529 Competing interests

530 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest

531 Acknowledgement

532 In alphabetical order, we thank Juan Barreneche, Lucia Gaucher, Sören Miehe, Nicolas Silvera 533 and Matias Zarucki for their assistance in field work. We thank Manuel Garcia and Meica 534 Valdivia for the pre-processing of samples. We thank the staff of the soil laboratory from the 535 Department of Soil and Natural Resources, University of Concepción, Chile. We thank Diego 536 de Panis for help with statistical analysis and visualization and valuable comments on a 537 previous version of this manuscript. Thanks to Vera Krause, Serafina Bischoff, Sophia Reitzug, 538 Rhea Rennert and Diego Nicolas Rojas for support with data analysis and plots and maps 539 visualization. We also thank all landowners for access permission to establish our monitoring 540 sites on their land, their hospitality and willingness to discuss land use goals concerning all 541 dimension of sustainability. The study was funded by the German Federal Ministry of 542 Education and Research (BMBF; 01LN1305A). Special thanks go to Amal Chatterjee for 543 improving our English.

544 **References**

- Alfaro, M., Dube, F. and Zagal, E.: The Influence of Overmature, Degraded Nothofagus
 Forests with Strong Anthropic Disturbance on the Quality of an Andisol and its Gradual
 Recovery with Silvopasture in Southwestern South America, in: Agroforestry for
 Degraded Landscapes, edited by: Dagar, J.C., Gupta, S.R., Teketay, D. Springer,
 Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-6807-7_3, 2020.
- 550 Baize, D. and van Oort, F.: Potentially Harmful Elements in Forest Soils, in: PHEs,

551 552	Environment and Human Health, edited by: Bini, C. and Bech, J., Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 151–198, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-8965-3_4, 2014.	
553 554 555	Benjamini Y, Hochberg, Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological), 1995; 57(1), 289-300. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2346101.	
556 557	Beretta-Blanco A, Pérez O, Carrasco-Letelier L. Soil quality decrease over 13 years of agricultural production. Nutr Cycling Agroecosyst. 2019; 114_45-55.	
558 559 560	Beretta-Blanco, A.; Carrasco-Letelier, L. Relevant factors in the eutrophication of the Uruguay River and the Río Negro. Sci. Total Environ. 2021, 761,143299; DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143299	
561 562 563	Berhongaray, G; Alvarez R. Soil carbon sequestration of Mollisols and Oxisols under grassland and tree plantations in South America - A review. Geoderma Regional 18 (2019) e00226.	
564 565 566	Berthrong, S. T., Jobbágy, E. G., and Jackson, R. B.: A global meta-analysis of soil exchangeable cations, pH, carbon, and nitrogen with afforestation, Ecological Applications, 19, 2228–2241, https://doi.org/10.1890/08-1730.1, 2009.	
567 568 569	Berthrong, S. T., Piñeiro, G., Jobbágy, E. G., and Jackson, R. B.: Soil C and N changes with afforestation of grasslands across gradients of precipitation and plantation age, 22, 76–86, https://doi.org/10.1890/10-2210.1, 2012.	
570 571 572	Binkley, Dan et al. The interactions of climate, spacing and genetics on clonal <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations across Brazil and Uruguay. Forest Ecology And Management. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Bv, v. 405, p. 271-283, doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2017.09.050	
573 574 575	Bonfante, A., Basile, A., and Bouma, J.: Targeting the soil quality and soil health concepts when aiming for the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals and the EU Green Deal, SOIL, 6, 453–466, https://doi.org/10.5194/soil-6-453-2020, 2020.	
576 577 578 579 580	Borrelli, P., Robinson, D. A., Fleischer, L. R., Lugato, E., Ballabio, C., Alewell, C., Meusburger, K., Modugno, S., Schütt, B., Ferro, V., Bagarello, V., Oost, K. V., Montanarella, L., and Panagos, P.: An assessment of the global impact of 21st century land use change on soil erosion, Nat Commun, 8, 2013, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467- 017-02142-7, 2017.	
581 582	Caon, L., & Vargas, R. (2017). Threats to soils: Global trends and perspectives. A Contribution from the Intergovernmental Technical Panel on Soils, Global Soil Partnership Food and	

hat gelöscht: :

- Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. In G. Pierzynski & Brajendra (Eds.),
 Global land outlook working paper, 28 pp.
- Carrasco-Letelier, L. and A. Beretta-Blanco. 2017. Soil erosion by water estimated for 99
 Uruguayan basins. Cien. Inv. Agr. 44(2): 184-194.
- 588 Céspedes-Payret et al. 2012 Science of the Total Environment 438 (2012) 549–557.
 589 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.08.075
- Cook, R. L., Binkley, D., and Stape, J. L.: Eucalyptus plantation effects on soil carbon after
 20years and three rotations in Brazil, Forest Ecology and Management, 359, 92–98,
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2015.09.035, 2016.
- Dass, P. et al 2018 Grasslands may be more reliable carbon sinks than forests in California.
 Environ. Res. Lett. 13 074027. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aacb39
- 595 De Faccio Carvalho, P. C., Savian, J. V., Chiesa, T. D., Souza Filho, W. D., Terra, J. A., Pinto,
 596 P., Martins, A. P., Villarino, S., Da Trindade, J. K., De Albuquerque Nunes, P. A., and
 597 Piñeiro, G.: Land-use intensification trends in the Rio de la Plata region of South
 598 America: toward specialization or recoupling crop and livestock production, Front.
 599 Agr. Sci. Eng., 8, 97, https://doi.org/10.15302/J-FASE-2020380, 2021.
- bi Sacco, A.; Hardwick, K.; Blakesley, D.; Brancalion, P.H.S.; Breman, E.; Cecilio Rebola,
 L.; Chomba, S.; Dixon, K.; Elliott, S.; Ruyonga, G.; Shaw, K.; Smith, P.; Smith, R.J.;
 Antonelli, A. Ten Golden Rules for Reforestation to Optimise Carbon Sequestration,
 Biodiversity Recovery and Livelihood Benefits. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15498.
 2020
- Durán, A., Morrás, H., Studdert, G., and Liu, X.: Distribution, properties, land use and management of Mollisols in South America, Chin. Geogr. Sci., 21, 511, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11769-011-0491-z, 2011.
- ESRI 2018. ArcGIS Desktop: Release 10.3. Redlands, CA: Environmental Systems Research
 Institute.
- 610 https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_051232.pdf
- FAO 2019. Land Use. Published online at OurWorldInData.org. Retrieved from:
 'https://ourworldindata.org/land-use' [Online Resource]
- Fernández, R., Frasier, I., Noellemeyer, E., and Quiroga, A.: Soil quality and productivity
 under zero tillage and grazing on Mollisols in Argentina A long-term study,
- 615 Geoderma Regional, 11, 44–52, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geodrs.2017.09.002, 2017.

- 616 Fox, J., Weisberg, S. (2019) An R Companion to Applied Regression, Third Edition, Sage.
- Friggens, N. L., Hester, A. J., Mitchell, R. J., Parker, T. C., Subke, J., and Wookey, P. A.: Tree
 planting in organic soils does not result in net carbon sequestration on decadal
 timescales, Glob Change Biol, 26, 5178–5188, <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15229</u>,
 2020.
- García-Préchac, F., Ernst, O., Siri-Prieto, G., and Terra, J. A.: Integrating no-till into crop pasture rotations in Uruguay, Soil and Tillage Research, 77, 1–13,
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2003.12.002, 2004.
- 624 Gomiero, Tiziano. 2016. "Soil Degradation, Land Scarcity and Food Security: Reviewing a 625 Complex Challenge" Sustainability 8, no. 3: 281. https://doi.org/10.3390/su8030281
- Hernández J, del Pino A, Salvo L, Arrarte G. Nutrient export and harvest residue
 decomposition patterns of a *Eucalyptus dunnii* Maiden plantation in temperate climate
 of Uruguay. Forest Ecology Management 2009; 258(2): 92-99.
 10.1016/j.foreco.2009.03.050
- Hernández, J., del Pino, A., Vance, E. D., Califra, Á., Del Giorgio, F., Martínez, L., and
 González-Barrios, P.: *Eucalyptus* and *Pinus* stand density effects on soil carbon
 sequestration, Forest Ecology and Management, 368, 28–38,
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2016.03.007, 2016.
- Hernandez-Ramirez, G., Sauer, T. J., Chendev, Y. G., and Gennadiev, A. N.: Nonlinear
 turnover rates of soil carbon following cultivation of native grasslands and subsequent
 afforestation of croplands, SOIL, 7, 415–431, https://doi.org/10.5194/soil-7-415-2021,
 2021.
- IUSS Working Group WRB. 2015. World Reference Base for Soil Resources 2014, update
 2015 International soil classification system for naming soils and creating legends for
 soil maps. World Soil Resources Reports No. 106. FAO, Rome.
 https://www.fao.org/3/i3794en/I3794en.pdf
- Jackson et al 2005 Trading Water for Carbon with Biological Carbon Sequestration. Science
 310, 1944 (2005); DOI: 10.1126/science.1119282
- Jackson, R.: Soil nutrient stocks are maintained over multiple rotations in Brazilian Eucalyptus
 plantations | Elsevier Enhanced Reader, 13, n.d.
- Jaurena M, Durante M, Devincenzi T, Savian JV, Bendersky D, Moojen FG, Pereira M, Soca
 P, Quadros FLF, Pizzio R, Nabinger C, Carvalho PCF and Lattanzi FA (2021) Native
 Grasslands at the Core: A New Paradigm of Intensification for the Campos of Southern

- 649 South America to Increase Economic and Environmental Sustainability. Front. Sustain.
 650 Food Syst. 5:547834. doi: 10.3389/fsufs.2021.547834
- 651 Jobbagy, E. G., and R. B. Jackson. 2003. Patterns and mechanisms of soil acidification in the 652 conversion of grasslands to forests. Biogeochemistry 64:205–229.
- Jobbagy, E. G., and R. B. Jackson. 2004. The uplift of soil nutrients by plants: biogeochemical
 consequences across scales. Ecology 85:2380–2389.
- Kaushal, S. S., Gold, A. J., Bernal, S., Johnson, T. A. N., Addy, K., Burgin, A., Burns, D. A.,
 Coble, A. A., Hood, E., Lu, Y., Mayer, P., Minor, E. C., Schroth, A. W., Vidon, P.,
 Wilson, H., Xenopoulos, M. A., Doody, T., Galella, J. G., Goodling, P., Haviland, K.,
 Haq, S., Wessel, B., Wood, K. L., Jaworski, N., and Belt, K. T.: Watershed 'chemical
 cocktails': forming novel elemental combinations in Anthropocene fresh waters,
 Biogeochemistry, 141, 281–305, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10533-018-0502-6, 2018.
- 661 Kellogg, C. E. "Soil survey division staff: soil survey manual. Chapter 3" United States
- 662 Department of Agriculture, Washington (1993).
- Kim, K., Daly, EJ, M. Gorzelak, Hernandez-Ramirez, G. 2022. Soil organic matter pools
 response to perennial grain cropping and nitrogen fertilizer. Soil and Tillage Research.
 220, 105376 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2022.105376
- Lambin, E.F.; Gibbs, H.K.; Ferreira, L.; Grau, R.; Mayaux, P.; Meyfroidt, P.; Morton, D.C.;
 Rudel, T.K.; Gasparri, I.; Munger, J. Estimating the world's potentially available
 cropland using a bottom-up approach. Glob. Environ. Chang. 2013, 23, 892–901.
- Lanfranco, B. and Sapriza, G.: El índice CONEAT como medida de productividad y valor de
 la tierra., 57, n.d.
- Lavado, R.S., Rodrírguez, M.B., Scheiner, S.D., Taboada, M.A., Rubio, G., Alvarez, R.,
 Alconada, M., Zubillaga, M.S., 1998. Heavy metals in soils of Argentina: comparison
 between urban and agricultural soils. Communi- cations in Soil Science and Plant
 Analysis 29, 1913–1917.
- Lavado, R.S., Zubillaga, M.S., Alvarez, R., Taboada, M.A., 2004. Baseline levels of potentially
 toxic elements in pampas soils. Soil and Sediment Contamination: An International
 Journal 13, 329–339.
- Li, H., Jiang, L., You, C., Tan, B., and Yang, W.: Dynamics of heavy metal uptake and soil
 heavy metal stocks across a series of Masson pine plantations, Journal of Cleaner
 Production, 269, 122395, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122395, 2020.

- Liu, X., Lee Burras, C., Kravchenko, Y. S., Durán, A., Huffman, T., Morras, H., Studdert, G.,
 Zhang, X., Cruse, R. M., and Yuan, X.: Overview of Mollisols in the world:
 Distribution, land use and management, Can. J. Soil. Sci., 92, 383–402,
 https://doi.org/10.4141/cjss2010-058, 2012.
- Mayer M., Prescott C.E., Abaker W.E.A., Augusto L., Cécillon L., Ferreira G.W.D., James J.,
 Jandl R., Katzensteiner K., Laclau J.-P., Laganière J., Nouvellon Y., Paré D., Stanturf
 J.A., Vanguelova E.I., Vesterdal L. Influence of forest management activities on soil
 SOC stocks: A knowledge synthesis. Forest Ecology and Management, Volume 466,
 2020
- McMahon, D. E., Vergütz, L., Valadares, S. V., Silva, I. R. da, and Jackson, R. B.: Soil nutrient
 stocks are maintained over multiple rotations in Brazilian Eucalyptus plantations,
 Forest Ecology and Management, 448, 364–375,
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2019.06.027, 2019.
- Merino, A., Balboa, M. A., Rodríguez Soalleiro, R., and González, J. G. Á.: Nutrient exports
 under different harvesting regimes in fast-growing forest plantations in southern
 Europe, Forest Ecology and Management, 207, 325–339,
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2004.10.074, 2005.
- 698 MGAP (Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca) 2020. CONEAT. Online: 699 https://www.gub.uy/ministerio-ganaderia-agricultura-pesca/politicas-y-gestion/coneat.
- 700 Modernel, P., Rossing, W. A. H., Corbeels, M., Dogliotti, S., Picasso, V., and Tittonell, P.: 701 Land use change and ecosystem service provision in Pampas and Campos grasslands 702 of southern South America, Environ. Res. Lett., 11. 113002. 703 https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/11/11/113002, 2016.
- OAS (Organization of American States, Department of Sustainable Development) 1994.
 Uruguay Proyecto Regional de Alternativas para la Inversión Forestal. Available
 online: http://www.oas.org/dsd/publications/unit/oea20s/oea20s.pdf.
- Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F. G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., McGlinn, D., Minchin, P.
 R., O'Hara, R. B., Simpson, G. L., Solymos, P., Stevens, M. H. H., Szoecs, E., and
 Wagner, H.: vegan: Community Ecology Package, 2020.
- Ortiz, J., Dube, F., Neira, P., Panichini, M., Stolpe, N.B., Zagal, E. and Martínez-Hernández,
 P.A. Soil Quality Changes within a (*Nothofagus obliqua*) Forest Under Silvopastoral
 Management in the Andes Mountain Range, South Central Chile. Sustainability;
 12(17):6815. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12176815, 2020.

hat formatiert: Spanisch

hat formatiert: Deutsch

- Paul, K. I., Polglase, P. J., Nyakuengama, J. G., and Khanna, P. K.: Change in soil carbon
 following afforestation, Forest Ecology and Management, 168, 241–257,
 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1127(01)00740-X, 2002.
- Piñeiro, D. E.: Land grabbing: concentration and "foreignisation" of land in Uruguay, Canadian
 Journal of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement, 33,
 471–489, https://doi.org/10.1080/02255189.2012.746216, 2012.
- R Core Team: R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, R Foundation for
 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, available at: https://www.R-project.org/, last
 access: 2 March 2021.
- Richter, D. D.: Game Changer in Soil Science. The Anthropocene in soil science and pedology., J. Plant Nutr. Soil Sci., 183, 5–11, https://doi.org/10.1002/jpln.201900320, 2020.
- Roca, N.: Heavy metal background levels in rural soils: a case study in Pampean soils
 (Argentina), 10, 2015.
- Sadzawka, A., Carrasco, R. M. A., Grez, Z. R., Mora, G. M, Flores, P. H. Neaman, A. 2006.
 Métodos de análisis recomendados para los suelos de Chile. Revisión 2006. Santiago,
 Chile: Serie Actas Instituto de Investigaciones Agropecuarias. Available online: https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14001/8541.
- Sandoval López, D.M., Arturi, M.F., Goya, J.F. et al. *Eucalyptus grandis* plantations: effects
 of management on soil carbon, nutrient contents and yields. J. For. Res. 31, 601–611
 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11676-018-0850-z_
- 735Soil Survey Staff. 1999. Soil taxonomy: A basic system of soil classification for making and736interpreting soil surveys. 2nd edition.737https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2 051232.pdf.
- Veldman, J. W., Overbeck, G. E., Negreiros, D., Mahy, G., Le Stradic, S., Fernandes, G. W.,
 Durigan, G., Buisson, E., Putz, F. E., and Bond, W. J.: Where Tree Planting and Forest
 Expansion are Bad for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, BioScience, 65, 1011–
 1018, https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biv118, 2015.
- Waters, C. N., Zalasiewicz, J., Summerhayes, C., Barnosky, A. D., Poirier, C., Ga uszka, A.,
 Cearreta, A., Edgeworth, M., Ellis, E. C., Ellis, M., Jeandel, C., Leinfelder, R., McNeill,
 J. R., Richter, D. d., Steffen, W., Syvitski, J., Vidas, D., Wagreich, M., Williams, M.,
 Zhisheng, A., Grinevald, J., Odada, E., Oreskes, N., and Wolfe, A. P.: The

Feldfunktion geändert

- 746Anthropocene is functionally and stratigraphically distinct from the Holocene, Science,747351, aad2622–aad2622, https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad2622, 2016.
- Wingeyer, A.B.; Amado, T.J.C.; Pérez-Bidegain, M.; Studdert, G.A.; Perdomo Varela, C.H.;
 Garcia, F.O.; Karlen, D.L. Soil Quality Impacts of Current South American
 Agricultural Practices. Sustainability 2015, 7, 2213–2242.
- Wu, R., Alvareda, E., Polya, D., Blanco, G., and Gamazo, P.: Distribution of Groundwater
 Arsenic in Uruguay Using Hybrid Machine Learning and Expert System Approaches,
 Water, 13, 527, https://doi.org/10.3390/w13040527, 2021.
- Zagal, E, Sadzawka, A. 2007. Protocolo de métodos de análisis para suelos y lodos. Available
 online: https://www.sag.cl/sites/default/files/METODOS_LODOS_SUELOS.pdf.
- Zurbriggen, C., González-Lago, M., Baraibar, M., Baethgen, W., Mazzeo, N. and Sierra, M.,
 2020. Experimentation in the Design of Public Policies: The Uruguayan Soils
 Conservation Plans. Iberoamericana Nordic Journal of Latin American and
 Caribbean Studies, 49(1), pp.52–62. DOI: http://doi.org/10.16993/iberoamericana.459_
- 760







763	Figure 1: Study design and sampling. (a) Location of the 28 monitoring sites across Uruguay
764	including land use types sampled (grassland (b); timber plantations, native forest and
765	agricultural land. Proportion of plots with particular category of soil classification according to
766	the World Reference Base (WRB, c), Soil Taxonomy (d) and CONEAT (Comisión Nacional
767	de Estudio Agronómico de la Tierra, e). The Uruguayan CONEAT index provides a detailed
768	classification that takes into account soil type, texture, natural vegetation, altitude and geology
769	(see details in chapter 2.3). Photos: RuralFutures.
770	





Figure 2. Spearman's rank correlations for parameters of topsoils (n=80) regarding (a) fertility 772

773 proxies, (b) acidity and (c) trace metals. The size of the circle refers to the absolute value of

```
774
       the correlation coefficient (\rho) and the color refers to the direction (positive or negative) of the
```

775 correlation, Empty slots show correlations with p>0.05. **hat gelöscht:** Colour intensity and the size of the circle are proportional to the correlation coefficients (ρ)



- 781 Figure 3. Non-metric multidimensional scaling showing significant clustering differences
- 782 among samples from (a) grassland (GL), timber plantations (TP) and native forests (NF); (b)
- 783 among samples from *Pinus* and *Eucalyptus* plantations; (c) among land uses (including
- 784 agriculture AC) in Argiudolls; (d) among land uses in Argiudolls & Hapluderts; (e) among land
- 785 uses in Argiudolls, Hapudolls & Hapludalf and (f) among land uses in Hapludalfs &
- 786 Hapludults.
- 787



- 789 Figure 4. Violin box plots for significant Kruskal-Wallis Tests across evaluated land uses (i.e.
- 790 grassland (GL), timber plantation (TP) and native forest (NF)) for each variable. Significance
- in posterior Wilcoxon pairwise comparisons is depicted as p<0.05 (*), p<0.01 (**), p<0.001
- 792 (***), p<0.0001 (****).
- 793







800 Figure 6. Acidity of all topsoils samples (a) and (b) according to different land use (GL:

801 Grassland, TP: Timber plantation, NF: Native forest, AC: Agriculture). Proportion of samples

802 with a given acidic category (Kellogg, 1993). pH of topsoil given as violin box plots for

803	significant k	Kruskal-Wallis	Tests across	different la	and uses	independ	lent from soil	Order (c) and
	0							

- 804 separated per soil Orders (d-f). Sample number (n) is given. Significance in posterior Wilcoxon
- 805 pairwise comparisons is depicted as p<0.05 (*), p<0.01 (**), p<0.001 (***), p<0.0001 (****).

807 Table 1. General characteristics of Uruguayan topsoils: descriptive statistics for the parameters

hat gelöscht: crops

811 4). SD = standard derivation.

			_		<u>Samples b</u>	y land us	<u>e</u>	
Variable	n	Mean <u>±SD</u>	Min-Max	<u>GL</u>	TP	NF	AC	
Soil moisture (%)	280	<u>18.9±10.8</u>	<u>1.34-51.5</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>15</u>	
N_total (%)	280	0.2±0.14	<u>0.04-1.2</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>15</u>	
C_total (%)	280	<u>3±2.3</u>	0.4-25.7	<u>115</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>15</u>	
C/N ratio	279	<u>13.3±1.8</u>	<u>9.1-20.6</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>15</u>	
SOC (%)	267	<u>5.6±3</u>	<u>0.8-16.4</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>15</u>	hat gelöscht: 5.6
P (mg kg ⁻¹)	278	295±166	<u>43-1008</u>	<u>114</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>14</u>	hat gelöscht: 295
Ca (cmol kg ⁻¹)	82	<u>9.4±8.9</u>	<u>0.3-42.7</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>5</u>	hat gelöscht: 9.4
Mg (cmol kg ⁻¹)	82	<u>2.5±2.2</u>	<u>0.1-9.7</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>5</u>	hat gelöscht: 2.5
K (cmol kg ⁻¹)	82	0.4±0.25	<u>0.03-1.44</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>5</u>	hat gelöscht: 0.4
Na (cmol kg ⁻¹)	82	<u>0.1±0.14</u>	<u>0-0.69</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>18</u>	5	hat gelöscht: 0.1
Zn (mg kg ⁻¹)	82	<u>1.9±2.1</u>	<u>0.1-9.7</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>5</u>	hat gelöscht: 1.9
Cu (mg kg ⁻¹)	82	5.4±22.1	0.3-161.2	<u>32</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>5</u>	hat gelöscht: 5.4
Fe (mg kg ⁻¹)	82	<u>134±75</u>	<u>5-309</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>5</u>	hat gelöscht: 134
Mn (mg kg ⁻¹)	81	<u>25±17</u>	<u>0.7-93</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>5</u>	hat gelöscht: 25
pН	279	4.8±0.8	<u>3.6-7.34</u>	<u>114</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>15</u>	hat gelöscht: 4.8
As (mg kg ⁻¹)	279	<u>3.9±3.6</u>	<u>0.6-30.7</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>15</u>	hat gelöscht: 3.9
Cd (mg kg ⁻¹)	274	<u>0.4±0.2</u>	<u>0.2-1</u>	<u>111</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>15</u>	hat gelöscht: 0.4
Cr (mg kg ⁻¹)	280	<u>13.6±12.6</u>	<u>2-78.9</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>15</u>	hat gelöscht: 13.6
Pb (mg kg ⁻¹)	280	<u>7±3.4</u>	<u>2-27.6</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>15</u>	hat gelöscht: 7
CEC (cmol kg ⁻¹)	82	<u>12.4±10.7</u>	<u>0.5-50.1</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>5</u>	hat gelöscht: 12.4
$K^{+}/(Ca^{2+}+Mg^{2+})$	82	0.07±0.08	0.01-0.43	<u>32</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>5</u>	hat gelöscht: 0.07
$K^{+}/(Ca^{2+}+Mg^{2+}+Na^{+})$	82	0.07±0.07	0.01-0.42	<u>32</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>5</u>	hat gelöscht: 0.07

⁸⁰⁸ of all single samples (n) across different land uses and classification to different soil types (for

details on different land uses i.e. grassland (GL), timber plantations (TP), native forests (NF)

⁸¹⁰ and <u>agricultural land (AC)</u> see Appendix A1-A2 and on different soil types see Appendix A3-

Appendices

834 Appendix A

835 Table A1. Descriptive statistics of topsoil variables for all single soil types at grassland and

836 native forests. Number of samples (n), mean, standard deviation (SD), minimum (Min) and

837 maximum (Max) of each variable are given.

838

833

			Grasslar	ıd				Native fo	orests	
Variable (unit)	n	Mean	SD	Min	Max	n	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Soil moisture (%)	115	20.4	11.5	1.5	51.5	57	25.8	9.3	6.3	50.3
N_total (%)	115	0.22	0.13	0.06	0.80	57	0.30	0.19	0.04	1.20
C_total (%)	115	2.9	1.9	0.7	10.8	57	4.2	3.6	0.5	25.7
C/N ratio	115	13.2	1.7	9.1	19.4	56	13.5	1.4	9.8	18.5
SOC (%)	109	5.3	2.6	1.4	15.2	53	7.5	3.8	1.1	16.4
P (mg/kg)	114	272	124	43	749	57	484	194	56	1009
Ca (cmol kg ⁻¹)	32	9.5	10.0	0.3	42.7	18	15.1	10.0	0.3	37.3
Mg (cmol kg ⁻¹)	32	2.2	2.1	0.18	9.7	18	4.8	2.6	0.12	8.9
K (cmol kg ⁻¹)	32	0.40	0.26	0.08	1.44	18	0.50	0.28	0.03	1.29
Na (cmol kg ⁻¹)	32	0.12	0.15	0.00	0.65	18	0.14	0.12	0.00	0.50
Zn (mg kg ⁻¹)	32	1.4	1.2	0.10	4.7	18	4.0	2.7	0.80	9.60
Cu (mg kg ⁻¹)	32	2.2	1.8	0.30	7.7	18	2.4	1.5	0.30	5.50
Fe (mg kg ⁻¹)	32	121	81	5	279	18	149	76	10	309
Mn (mg kg ⁻¹)	32	22	18	2	93	17	33	18	1	72
pН	114	4.9	0.9	3.6	7.3	57	5.1	0.7	3.6	7.2
As (mg kg ⁻¹)	115	4.3	4.5	0.6	30.7	56	4.1	2.5	1.2	13.6
Cd (mg kg ⁻¹)	111	0.41	0.17	0.17	1.00	57	0.45	0.15	0.17	0.81
Cr (mg kg ⁻¹)	115	12.3	9.2	2.6	49.5	57	22.8	17.3	2.0	70.7
Pb (mg kg ⁻¹)	115	6.8	3.0	2.3	15.9	57	9.5	4.8	2.9	27.7
CEC (cmol/ kg ⁻¹)	32	12.2	11.5	0.8	50.1	18	20.4	11.4	0.5	44.6
K+/(Ca2++Mg2+)	32	0.08	0.10	0.01	0.43	18	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.07
K+/(Ca2++Mg2++Na+)	32	0.08	0.10	0.01	0.42	18	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.07

840 Table A2. Descriptive statistics for of topsoil variables for all single soil types at timber

841 plantations and <u>agricultural land</u>. Number of samples (n), mean, standard deviation (SD),

hat gelöscht: crops

hat gelöscht: Crops

- 842 minimum (Min) and maximum (Max) of each variable are given.
- 843

		Ti	mber plan	tations			Ag	ricultura	ıl land	
Variable (unit)	n	Mean	SD	Min	Max	n	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Soil moisture (%)	93	13.2	7.0	1.7	38.0	15	18.1	12.0	1.3	50.5
N_total (%)	93	0.18	0.10	0.04	0.61	15	0.22	0.06	0.13	0.29
C_total (%)	93	2.5	1.5	0.4	8.4	15	2.6	0.7	1.4	3.3
C/N ratio	93	13.6	2.1	10.0	20.6	15	11.7	0.7	10.5	12.8
SOC (%)	90	4.9	2.8	0.8	16.1	15	5.2	1.3	2.8	6.7
P (mg kg ⁻¹)	93	206	91	56	551	14	310	120	142	613
Ca (cmol kg ⁻¹)	27	5.2	4.8	0.6	18	5	10.8	5.5	7.2	20.4
Mg (cmol kg ⁻¹)	27	1.4	1.0	0.16	4.1	5	2.5	1.0	1.76	4.1
K (cmol kg ⁻¹)	27	0.32	0.21	0.09	0.93	5	0.46	0.23	0.29	0.85
Na (cmol kg ⁻¹)	27	0.11	0.16	0.00	0.69	5	0.06	0.02	0.03	0.08
Zn (mg kg ⁻¹)	27	0.94	0.74	0.10	2.8	5	3.7	3.7	0.60	9.7
Cu (mg kg ⁻¹)	27	1.5	0.9	0.5	4.5	5	57.7	78.8	0.8	161.0
Fe (mg kg ⁻¹)	27	143	69	16	290	5	115	62	63	210
Mn (mg kg ⁻¹)	27	25	16	6	72	5	17	5	10	23
pН	93	4.5	0.7	3.6	6.8	15	5.1	0.4	4.2	5.7
As (mg kg ⁻¹)	93	3.4	3.0	0.7	25.5	15	3.1	1.2	1.1	5.5
Cd (mg kg ⁻¹)	91	0.33	0.11	0.16	0.65	15	0.41	0.14	0.21	0.66
Cr (mg kg ⁻¹)	93	10.6	11.3	2.0	78.9	15	7.8	1.8	5.0	11.3
Pb (mg kg ⁻¹)	93	6.1	2.3	2.0	11.7	15	5.1	1.2	3.4	7.3
CEC (cmol kg ⁻¹)	27	7.0	5.6	1.0	20.6	5	13.8	6.5	9.5	25.0
K+/(Ca2++Mg2+)	27	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.25	5	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.09
K ⁺ /(Ca ²⁺ +Mg ²⁺ +Na ⁺)	27	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.25	5	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.08

844

845

849	Table A3. I	Descriptive s	tatistics of to	psoil variables	for Argiudolls	and for grassland	d and native
					0	8	

forests within of Argiudolls. Number of single samples (n), mean, standard deviation (SD),

minimum (Min) and maximum (Max) of each variable are given.

		Tot	al Argiu	dolls				Grasslar	nd			Na	ative for	ests	
Variable (Unit)	n	Mean	SD	Min	Max	n	Mean	SD	Min	Max	n	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Soil moisture (%)	77	18.3	10.9	1.3	50.5	31	19.0	9.2	5.0	49.0	12	26.4	13.4	9.0	48.2
N total (%)	77	0.24	0.15	0.07	1.20	31	0.21	0.11	0.07	0.66	12	0.34	0.28	0.13	1.20
C total (%)	77	3.3	3.0	1.1	25.7	31	2.9	1.8	1.1	10.8	12	5.3	6.5	1.7	25.7
C/N ratio	76	13.3	2.2	9.8	19.9	31	13.3	2.1	10.5	19.4	11	13.6	2.1	9.8	18.5
SOC (%)	73	5.8	2.5	2.1	16.1	30	5.2	1.9	2.1	10.0	9	7.4	2.1	4.8	11.0
$P(mg kg^{-1})$	76	280	122	93	693	30	234	78	93	353	12	438	155	155	693
Γ (ling kg ⁻¹)	21	11.4	8.0	2.6	37.1	8	11.5	6.7	3.2	20.5	12	16.2	14.3	5.1	37.1
Mg (amal kg ⁻¹)	21	2.3	1.4	0.5	6.1	0	2.0	0.8	0.9	3.2	4	3.5	2.5	1.0	6.1
K (amal kg ⁻¹)	21	0.45	0.26	0.1	1.3	0 0	0.4	0.14	0.16	0.61	4	0.69	0.41	0.34	1.29
Na (amal kg ⁻¹)	21	0.08	0.05	0.03	0.26	0	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.10	4	0.10	0.11	0.03	0.26
Tra (cinor kg)	21	2.4	3.0	0.1	10	0	1.3	0.8	0.1	2.2	4	5.1	4.3	1.3	10
Zn (mg kg)	21	15.5	42.7	0.8	161	0	2.6	1.6	1.0	6.0	4	1.9	1.0	0.8	3.0
Cu (mg kg)	21	117	62	10	232	0	104	50	28	171	4	117	84	10	216
	21	23.3	10.4	7.1	43.6	0	20.5	10.4	7.1	33.8	4	28.8	10.4	15.4	39.4
Min (mg kg ¹)	21	5.0	0.7	3.8	6.6	8	4.9	0.7	3.9	6.6	4	5.2	0.5	4.3	6.1
pH	77	3.2	1.4	1.0	12.2	31	2.9	0.9	1.5	4.9	12	4.0	2.8	1.5	12.2
As (mg kg ⁻¹)	76	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.7	31	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.7	11	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.7
Cd (mg kg ⁻¹)	76	9.3	6.2	2.2	28.3	30	8.1	4.1	3.6	18.5	12	13.2	9.5	2.2	28.3
Cr (mg kg ⁻¹)	77	5.6	2.1	2.8	10.7	31	5.2	1.8	2.8	9.6	12	6.8	2.9	2.9	10.7
Pb (mg kg ⁻¹)	77	14.2	9.3	3.4	44.6	31	14.0	7.3	4.5	23.1	12	20.4	16.7	6.4	44.6
CEC (cmol kg ⁻¹)	21	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.09	8	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.07	4	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.06
K ⁺ /(Ca ²⁺ +Mg ²⁺)	21	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.08	8	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.07	4	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.06
K ⁺ /(Ca ²⁺ +Mg ²⁺ +Na ⁺)	21	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.00	8	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.07	4	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.00

855 Table A4. Descriptive statistics of topsoil variables for Argiudolls and timber plantations and

856 <u>Agricultural land</u> within of Argiudolls. Number of single samples (n), mean, standard deviation

hat gelöscht: crops

- 857 (SD), minimum (Min) and maximum (Max) of each variable are given.
- 858 |

Variable (unit)nMeanSDMinMaxnMeanSDMinMaxnMeanSDMinMaxnMeanSDMinSoll moisture (%)771.831.091.350. 22 0.220.100.100.45120.220.060.13 Λ_{1} total (%)773.33.01.12.57223.21.61.28.0122.660.71.4 C_{1} total (%)773.33.01.12.57221.402.611.31.991211.80.61.07SOC (%)735.82.52.116.1226.433.32.31.61125.21.42.8P (mg kg ¹)762801229.93693222.447.0111353123.211.192.04Ca (cmol kg ¹)211.1.48.02.65.151.50.80.52.741.1.75.97.7Mg (cmol kg ¹)210.450.60.01.250.440.050.040.060.20.020.04A (cmol kg ¹)210.450.650.00.350.10.060.050.244.11.75.97.7Mg (cmol kg ¹)210.50.40.50.50.40.050.050.444.14.2 </th <th></th> <th colspan="5">Total Argiudolls Timber plantations</th> <th>hat gelöscht: Crops</th>		Total Argiudolls Timber plantations					hat gelöscht: Crops										
Soil moisture (%)7718.310.91.350.52214.07.85.538.01216.513.01.3N_total (%)770.240.150.071.20220.220.100.100.45120.220.060.13C_total (%)773.33.01.125.7223.21.61.28.0122.60.71.4C.N ratio7613.32.29.819.92214.02.611.319.91211.80.610.7SOC (%)735.82.52.116.1226.33.32.316.1125.21.42.8P (mg kg ⁻¹)7628012293693222347011135312321119204Ca (cmol kg ⁻¹)211.48.02.637.156.94.12.611.4411.75.97.7Mg (cmol kg ⁻¹)210.450.260.091.2950.340.210.090.6040.460.270.29Na (cmol kg ⁻¹)210.450.260.091.2950.50.40.21.244.14.20.6Cu (mg kg ⁻¹)210.450.260.091.2950.50.40.21.244.14.20.6Cu (mg kg ⁻¹)21 <td>Variable (unit) n</td> <td>n</td> <td>Mean</td> <td>SD</td> <td>Min</td> <td>Max</td> <td>n</td> <td>Mean</td> <td>SD</td> <td>Min</td> <td>Max</td> <td>n</td> <td>Mean</td> <td>SD</td> <td>Min</td> <td>Max</td> <td></td>	Variable (unit) n	n	Mean	SD	Min	Max	n	Mean	SD	Min	Max	n	Mean	SD	Min	Max	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	1 moisture (%) 77	77	18.3	10.9	1.3	50.5	22	14.0	7.8	5.5	38.0	12	16.5	13.0	1.3	50.5	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	total (%) 77	77	0.24	0.15	0.07	1.20	22	0.22	0.10	0.10	0.45	12	0.22	0.06	0.13	0.29	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	total (%) 77	77	3.3	3.0	1.1	25.7	22	3.2	1.6	1.2	8.0	12	2.6	0.7	1.4	3.3	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	vratio 76	76	13.3	2.2	9.8	19.9	22	14.0	2.6	11.3	19.9	12	11.8	0.6	10.7	12.7	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	С (%) 73	73	5.8	2.5	2.1	16.1	22	6.3	3.3	2.3	16.1	12	5.2	1.4	2.8	6.7	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	mg kg ⁻¹) 76	76	280	122	93	693	22	234	70	111	353	12	321	119	204	613	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(cmol kg ⁻¹) 21	21	11.4	8.0	2.6	37.1	5	6.9	4.1	2.6	11.4	4	11.7	5.9	7.7	20.4	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(cmol kg ⁻¹) 21	21	2.3	1.4	0.5	6.1	5	1.5	0.8	0.5	2.7	4	2.6	1.1	1.8	4.1	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	cmol kg ⁻¹) 21	21	0.45	0.26	0.09	1.29	5	0.34	0.21	0.09	0.60	4	0.46	0.27	0.29	0.85	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(cmol kg ⁻¹) 21	21	0.08	0.05	0.0	0.3	5	0.1	0.06	0.05	0.20	4	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.08	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(mg kg ⁻¹) 21	21	2.4	3.0	0.1	9.7	5	0.5	0.4	0.2	1.2	4	4.1	4.2	0.6	9.7	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(mg kg ⁻¹) 21	21	15.5	42.7	0.8	101	5	2.0	1.5	1.0	4.5	4	/1.8	83.4	0.8	101	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(mg kg ⁻¹) 21	21	22.2	10.4	7.1	42.6	5	20.9	75	17.5	42.6	4	15.2	27	0.0	145	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$. (mg kg ⁻¹) 21	21	23.5	0.7	2.0	45.0	5	29.0	9.0	2.0	45.0	4	5.5	0.2	9.9 4.0	57	
As (mg kg ¹) 76 5.2 1.4 1.0 1.2 22 3.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.1	77	77	3.0	1.4	3.6	12.2	22	4.9	1.0	3.8	0.4	12	3.2	0.5	4.9	5.7	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(mg kg ⁻¹) 76	76	0.20	0.12	0.19	0.74	22	0.27	0.12	0.19	4.4	12	0.42	0.12	2.1	5.5	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(mg kg ⁻¹) 76	76	0.39	6.2	0.18	28.2	22	0.57	7.2	0.18	26.4	12	0.43	1.7	6.0	11.2	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(mg kg ⁻¹) 77	77	5.6	2.1	2.2	10.7	22	5.6	2.1	2.7	20.4	12	5.3	1.7	3.0	73	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(mg kg ⁻¹) 77	77	14.2	0.3	3.4	10.7	22	9.0	2.1	2.0	13.6	12	14.8	7.0	0.0	25.0	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	C (cmol kg ⁻¹) 21	21	0.04	9.5	0.02	0.1	5	0.04	4.0	0.02	0.07	4	0.04	0.03	9.9 0.02	25.0	
$K^{+}(C_{2}^{2+}+M_{3}^{2+}+N_{3}^{+})$ 21 0.04 0.02 0.02 0.06 0.04 0.02 0.02 0.07 0.04 0.03 0.02	(Ca ²⁺ +Mg ²⁺) 21	21	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.08	5	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.07	4	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.09	
K (Ca mg ma) 21	$(Ca^{2+}+Mg^{2+}+Na^{+})$ 21	21	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.08	5	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.07	4	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.08	