Effects of moss restoration on topsoil water dynamics in a temperate vineyard

Silvana Oldenburg[1], Martin Nebel[2], Steffen Seitz[1,3], Corinna Gall[1]

[1] Soil Science and Geomorphology, Department of Geosciences, University of Tübingen, Rümelinstr. 19–23, 72070 Tübingen, Germany
[2] Nees Institute for Biodiversity of Plants, University of Bonn, Meckenheimer Allee 170, 53115 Bonn, Germany
[3] Physical Geography, Institute of Geography, Osnabrück University, Seminarstr. 19, 49074 Osnabrück, Germany

Correspondence to: Silvana Oldenburg (silvana.oldenburg@posteo.de)

Abstract. Climate change is intensifying pressure on vineyard soil and water management, particularly under-vine, where vegetation is commonly suppressed to minimize competition with grapevines. Bryophytes represent a promising but little-tested alternative to bare soil or cover crops. We evaluated moss restoration as an under-vine ground cover in a temperate, rainfed vineyard in southwestern Germany, comparing it with bare soil and cover crop (grass) over a 22-month field experiment. Continuous topsoil moisture measurements using time-domain transmission sensors were used to analyse the initial response time (the time between the onset of precipitation and the first increase in topsoil moisture) and the peak response time (the time between the onset of precipitation and the maximum topsoil moisture). We additionally quantified mean topsoil moisture and drying rates and monitored treatment development during and after maintenance.

Moss restoration did not significantly delay topsoil moisture response times following precipitation compared to grass or bare soil. Initial response times followed the pattern grass > moss > bare soil; differences between treatments were most pronounced under light and moderate precipitation and declined with increasing intensity, with moss and bare soil converging under heavy events. Peak response times followed a similar pattern (grass > moss ≈ bare soil), with significant differences restricted to light and heavy precipitation events: grass exhibited longer peak response times than bare soil under light rainfall and longer times than both bare soil and moss under heavy rainfall. Mean topsoil moisture did not differ significantly among treatments, whereas drying rates were higher under moss and bare soil than under grass. Moss plots initially suppressed grass establishment and consistently exhibited the lowest variability in topsoil moisture response, although vegetation cover and functional differences between treatments gradually converged after maintenance ceased.

Overall, moss restoration maintained topsoil moisture dynamics comparable to bare soil while avoiding the delayed infiltration and higher variability associated with grass cover. These results suggest that mosses may provide a low-maintenance under-vine ground cover with stable hydrological functioning, warranting further investigation into their long-term persistence and performance under future climate and management scenarios.

1 Introduction

Climate change is profoundly affecting viticulture worldwide. Most grape-producing regions now face shifts in phenology, declining yields and quality, and increasing vulnerability to pests, diseases, and extreme weather events (Mirás-Avalos and Araujo, 2021; van Leeuwen et al., 2024). Among these challenges, water scarcity has emerged as a central constraint (van Leeuwen et al., 2019), with water availability projected to decrease in many regions of the world (IPCC, 2021). The severity of this threat was illustrated during July 2022, when Europe experienced one of its most intense drought–heat episodes on record: precipitation in vineyards dropped by 46.5% and topsoil moisture by 29.8%, affecting nearly one-fifth of European vineyards (Straffelini et al., 2023). With such extremes projected to increase in frequency, water availability represents a critical bottleneck for the future of viticulture (Diago, 2023).

Conventional vineyard management often relies on mechanical tillage between rows and herbicide application beneath the vines to suppress vegetation and minimize competition for nutrients or avoid the spread of diseases (Celette et al., 2005; Steenwerth and Belina, 2010; Dittrich et al., 2021). While this approach can help maintain vine productivity, it affects runoff and topsoil water fluxes potentially also increasing soil evaporation and reducing infiltration, which might intensify water stress (Biddoccu et al., 2016).

To counter these negative effects, regenerative management strategies have been developed for both between-row and under-vine zones. Between-row approaches, such as allowing spontaneous vegetation to establish or sowing grasses and cover crops (Morvan et al., 2014; Kirchhoff et al., 2017), as well as under-vine practices including mulching (Prosdocimi et al., 2016) or planting aromatic herbs (Dittrich et al., 2021), can enhance soil water retention, reduce runoff, open new possibilities for weed and pathogen control, and improve overall soil health (O'Brien et al., 2025). However, these practices may affect grape yield in some cases through competition for water and nutrients, depending on local conditions, climate, and species selection (Celette et al., 2005; Ruiz-Colmenero et al., 2011; Dittrich et al., 2021). The extent to which vines are affected is closely linked to root system architecture: vine rooting depth and distribution vary with species, plant age, soil type, and management, and although roots can extend to several metres, the majority are typically concentrated within the upper metre of soil (Smart et al., 2006; Lehnart et al., 2008; Lanari et al. 2025). Taken together, these considerations underscore the need for adaptive, site-specific water management strategies that balance ecological function with sustained vineyard productivity.

Against this backdrop, bryophytes represent a promising but largely underexplored option for under-vine ground cover in vineyards. Their traits offer practical advantages: minimal maintenance requirements, the ability to establish in soils unsuitable for vascular plants, high resilience and persistence under conditions where conventional cover crops often fail (Corbin and Thiet, 2020; Gall et al., 2022). Despite these advantages, their use in viticulture has scarcely been tested. Gall et al. (2025) pioneered this approach by evaluating moss restoration as a tool for erosion control and runoff reduction in temperate vineyards, where mosses significantly reduced surface runoff by 71.4% and sediment discharge by 75.8% compared with bare soil.

In parallel, studies from other ecosystems have examined the broader hydrological functions of bryophytes. As poikilohydric organisms, they can absorb and retain substantial amounts of water (Price et al. 1997; Proctor et al., 1998), thereby influencing soil hydrology (Turetsky et al., 2012; Thielen et al., 2021; Gall et al., 2024). But their role in regulating water fluxes remains debated: some studies report reduced evapotranspiration (Thielen et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2022), whereas others suggest enhanced rates (Bu et al., 2015; Fischer et al., 2023). Similarly, mosses have been shown to promote infiltration and increase soil water content (Gypser et al., 2016; Oishi 2018; Sun et al., 2021; Tu et al., 2022), to restrict water movement into deeper layers (Yair et al., 2011; Xiao et al., 2015; Li et al., 2016), or to exert seasonally variable effects (Siwach et al., 2021). These contrasting results highlight the strong context dependence of moss hydrological functions, shaped by community structure, climate, seasonality, and species identity (Belnap, 2006; Bu et al., 2015; Dollery et al., 2022; Tu et al., 2022).

Recent studies have begun to clarify the mechanisms underlying these hydrological effects. Hu et al. (2023) showed that moss layers enhance soil water retention by altering pore structure and promoting organic matter accumulation. Similarly, moss colonization has been found to reduce evaporation and increase soil water storage in karst landscapes (Lulu and Dongdong, 2025). Li et al. (2026) also recently found that moss carpets cultivated on burlap increase soil moisture by 16.11 % compared to bare soil controls when applied in the field. Experimental work by Zeng et al. (2025) further revealed that moss cover increases surface roughness and substantially reduces runoff and erosion, particularly on steeper slopes, thereby enhancing the soil's water-holding capacity.

Consistent with these findings, studies using moss species similar to those applied here reported enhanced topsoil moisture without impeding infiltration (Thielen et al., 2021). Complementary work by Gall et al. (2021, 2022, 2024, 2025) highlighted that mosses improve soil water retention, promote infiltration, and mitigate surface runoff and erosion under both controlled and field conditions. Collectively, these results indicate that, under appropriate environmental conditions, mosses can act as conduits rather than barriers for water movement, underscoring their potential as vineyard ground cover (Gall et al., 2025).

The successful establishment of moss-based ground covers depends on both appropriate cultivation techniques and the selection of suitable species (Cruz de Carvalho et al., 2016; Varela et al., 2021). Both aspects had been evaluated in vineyard systems prior to the present study. The pre-cultivated moss mats used in this study were supplied by Reinhold Hummel GmbH & Co. KG (Germany), representing a restoration approach with potential future application in viticulture. While these aspects are essential for practical implementation, their complexity requires a detailed description beyond the scope of the present study and will be addressed separately.

To evaluate whether moss restoration represents a viable under-vine soil surface management strategy, rather than herbicide-induced bare soil or cover crop (grass), several factors must be considered. While the effects on surface runoff and erosion have already been demonstrated by Gall et al. (2025), the influence of moss restoration on vineyard soil water dynamics remains unclear. In rainfed vineyards, it is crucial that water infiltrates rapidly into the soil and that the ground cover does not compete excessively with the vines. We therefore use the initial (IRT) and peak (PRT) response times of topsoil moisture to

precipitation as metrics of soil moisture dynamics, and the topsoil drying rate as an indicator of desiccation processes. We hypothesize that:

(1) Moss restoration does not significantly delay topsoil moisture response times after precipitation events, regardless of rain intensity.

(2) Moss restoration shows a higher mean topsoil moisture due to a slower drying rate compared to bare soil and cover crop (grass).

(3) Differences in topsoil moisture response between moss restoration, grass and bare soil decrease over time once maintenance ceases due to natural succession.

With this experimental study, we aim to provide insight into the effects of moss restoration on soil moisture dynamics in the under-vine area of temperate vineyards.

2 Methodology

2.1 Study site

The study was conducted in a vineyard located on a gentle slope with a 5° incline south of Fellbach (48.80158° N, 9.28113° E) in southwestern Germany. The site is managed by the wine cooperative "Fellbacher Weingärtner" and the Lemberger grape variety is cultivated with continuous cover crops between vine rows. The soil was identified as a Mollic Anthrosol (Relocatic), reflecting anthropogenic modification through deep ploughing, a practice frequently employed in vineyards (IUSS Working Group WRB, 2022). The soil was classified as a clay loam throughout the profile. In the 0–25 cm layer, the soil contained 23% sand, 39% silt, and 38% clay, with a bulk density of 0.96 g cm^{-3}. The 25–90 cm layer also had a clay loam texture, comprising 24% sand, 42% silt, and 34% clay, however, the bulk density was not measured here.

The study was carried out at the experimental vineyard described by Gall et al. (2025), using the same treatment framework and sizes. However, it focuses on a different research objective by investigating soil moisture dynamics instead of runoff and erosion processes.




Figure 1: Overview of the study site in Fellbach and photos showing the installation of the TMS-4 dataloggers beneath the vines in the respective treatments: bare, grass, and moss. (Map of Germany: © BKG (2026) dl-de/by-2-0. Data sources: https://sgx.geodatenzentrum.de/web_public/gdz/datenquellen/datenquellen_vg_nuts.pdf, modified by the authors (study site was added); Orthophoto of Fellbach: © LGL (2023) dl-by-de/2.0. Data sources: www.lgl-bw.de, modified by the authors (study site and labels were added).

2.2 Experimental design and treatments

Experimental treatments were established on 17 February 2022 within four vine rows at the study site. Three treatments were applied, each on a surface of 40 cm × 40 cm: moss restoration (moss), bare soil (bare), and cover crops (grass), each replicated four times. The plot size corresponds to the dimensions of the micro-scale runoff plots used in previous rainfall simulations at the same study site (Gall et al., 2025) and was selected to match the width of a single vine row (approximately 40 cm). Larger plots would have extended beyond the vine row and included the adjacent tractor track, which was intentionally excluded from the measurements. The pre-cultivated moss mats used in the experiment were adapted to this size, resulting in complete coverage of each moss treatment plot. The bare treatment was maintained by periodic weeding to keep vegetation cover below ~20%. Establishment of both the moss and bare treatments involved removing existing cover crops and, where possible,

associated roots by gentle, non-soil disturbing weeding. The grass treatment retained the existing cover crop mixture dominated by the grasses *Lolium perenne* and *Trisetum flavescens*, with occasional occurrences of *Trifolium repens* and *Achillea millefolium* (identified using Jäger and Werner, 2005). The moss treatment involved installing pre-cultivated moss mats (produced by Reinhold Hummel GmbH+Co.KG, Stuttgart, Germany) with five species: *Amblystegium serpens (Hedw.) Schimp., Brachythecium rutabulum (Hedw.) Schimp., Funaria hygrometrica Hedw., Homalothecium lutescens (Hedw.) Robins, Oxyrrhynchium hians (Hedw.) Loeske* on weeded soil surfaces which were initially watered to promote establishment.

2.3 Monitoring of topsoil moisture

For this study, continuous topsoil moisture data was recorded with time-domain-transmission sensors by TMS-4 dataloggers (TOMST, Czech Republic) installed in all plots on 14 April 2022. Measurements were conducted at a spatial scale corresponding to the 40 × 40 cm treatment plots, with four replicate measurements per treatment to account for local spatial variability. The TMS-4 dataloggers are designed to mimic a small herbaceous plant and capture its microclimate, so that each device measures volumetric topsoil moisture to ~14 cm depth and air/soil temperature at three heights (15 cm above ground, 2 cm above ground, and 6 cm below ground; Wild et al., 2019). Given this fine-scale observation, the measurements are intended to characterize topsoil moisture dynamics at the microsite scale and are not designed to capture the full spatial integration of infiltration and percolation processes across a vineyard row or hillslope. To synchronize measurements and avoid temporal offsets, all dataloggers were installed simultaneously. All TMS-4 measurements were logged in Coordinated Universal Time (UTC). Data were collected over a 22-month period for analysis at 5-minute intervals and cross-checked to ensure data validity and quality. Datalogger calibration was performed using soil parameters specific to the study site, including clay, sand, and loam fractions. Soil characteristics were derived from laboratory analyses reported in Gall et al. (2025), encompassing grain size distribution, soil pH, organic carbon content, and bulk density.

2.4 Monitoring natural succession of treatments

Monitoring the development of the treatments served to document how their conditions changed over time and to identify periods during which they remained functionally distinct. These observations were necessary for subsequent analyses but not part of the hypothesis testing.

The study was structured into distinct periods based on management practices and expected vegetation dynamics:

Maintenance period (April–October 2022): During this period, treatment conditions were actively maintained. Grass was manually removed from moss and bare soil plots using cutting or gentle hand-weeding, while avoiding disturbance of the soil.

First succession period (November 2022–February 2023): Maintenance ceased at the start of November 2022, allowing natural succession to proceed during the winter months, when limited vegetation growth was expected.

Second succession period (March 2023–February 2024): This period encompassed the full growing season and subsequent months, beginning in spring 2023. It allowed evaluation of whether moss treatments could maintain dominance over grasses throughout an entire growing season without intervention.

Target period (September–November 2022): During this three-month transition from maintenance to the first succession phase, moss cover was vigorous and green, mat material fully decomposed, and soil largely bare with minimal grass.

Ground vegetation cover was assessed using the quadrat method, following the approach of Belnap (2001) and as applied by Gall et al. (2022). For each plot, a digital grid of 100 squares was overlaid on a photograph, and each square containing more than 50% vegetation was counted. Importantly, the assessment considered only vegetation emerging directly from the surface within the grid square, rather than overhanging parts such as blades of grass extending from adjacent areas. For moss treatments, total vegetation cover was further distinguished between moss and grass (Table 2). Each vegetated grid square was carefully evaluated using field experience to determine whether moss or grass dominated the area. All values reported as absolute percentages of the total plot area (not relative to each other).

2.5 Meteorological data and precipitation analysis

Meteorological data were obtained from the agricultural weather station in Fellbach (Agrarmeteorologie Baden-Württemberg), located within the vineyard approximately 10 m from the experimental plots (48.80158° N, 9.28113° E). The station records precipitation (mm, 10-min intervals), global solar radiation (Wh m^{-2}), air temperature (2 m above ground), relative humidity (%), and other meteorological variables. Due to its close proximity to the experimental plots, the Fellbach station provides a representative characterization of the local microclimate. Therefore, the period 2006–2021 was used as the local reference period for evaluating meteorological conditions during the study period (April 2022–February 2024).

Relative to the local reference period, the study period was warmer (+1.4–1.6 °C) and drier (−10–13%), with slightly higher global radiation in 2022 (+2%) and lower radiation in 2023 (−9%) (Table 1; Agrarmeteorologie Baden-Württemberg, 2025a, b). Seasonal differences within the study period were also pronounced, with a hot and dry summer in 2022 (June–August: 21.9 °C, 157 mm) compared with a similarly warm but wetter summer in 2023 (21.3 °C, 211 mm). Winter conditions also differed, with winter 2023/24 being warmer and wetter than winter 2022/23 (Figure 1).

At the national scale, 2022 was among the warmest and sunniest years since 1881, characterized by multiple summer heatwaves and drought conditions, whereas 2023 was the warmest year on record and had above-average precipitation (DWD, 2023a, b; DWD, 2024a, b). Compared with the German annual average, the Fellbach site showed consistently warmer and drier conditions (Table 1). These contrasting meteorological conditions provide the climatic context for interpreting soil moisture and vegetation dynamics during the experiment.

Table 1: Comparison of mean annual meteorological variables between the study site (Fellbach) and the German national average. For Fellbach, values are shown for the reference period (2006–2021) and the study years (2022–2023), including relative differences (Δ%). For Germany, values are shown for the reference period (1961–1990) and the study years (2022–2023). Data sources: Agrarmeteorologie Baden-Württemberg (2025) and Deutscher Wetterdienst (2023a, 2024a).

	Fellbach (study site)					Germany		
Variable	**2006–2021**	**2022**	**Δ2022%**	**2023**	**Δ2023%**	**1961-1990**	**2022**	**2023**
Relative Humidity (%)	73.52	72.0	−2.1%	73.1	−0.6%	-	-	-
Temperature (°C)	11.27	12.7	+12.7%	12.9	+14.4%	8.2	10.5	12.9
Global Radiation (Wh m^{-2})	1126.52	1148.6	+2.0%	1026.5	−8.9%	1544	1026.5	1026.5
Precipitation (mm a^{-1})	665.5	577.7	−13.2%	599.5	−9.9%	788.9	577.7	599.5




Figure 2: Weather conditions for Fellbach with monthly data from February 2022 till February 2024, showing monthly sum of precipitation (mm), monthly average air temperature (°C), monthly sum of global radiation (kWh m-2), monthly relative air humidity (%).

To characterize precipitation dynamics during the experiment, precipitation data from April 2022 to February 2024 were analysed and classified according to German Meteorological Service (DWD, 2026) intensity thresholds using both 10-min and 60-min precipitation records: violent: ≥ 50 mm h^{-1} and/or ≥ 8.3 mm (10 min^{-1}); heavy: ≥ 10 mm h^{-1} and/or ≥ 1.7 mm (10 min^{-1}); moderate: ≥ 2.5 mm h^{-1} and/or ≥ 0.5 mm (10 min^{-1}); light: below the above thresholds.

A total of 422 precipitation events were identified, comprising 285 light, 101 moderate, 34 heavy, and 2 violent events, their distribution over the study periods is shown in Table 2. Of all events, 313 met both the 10-min and 60-min criteria, while 109 were classified based on the 10-min threshold only. For each event, duration, peak timing, and mean precipitation rate were calculated. Event durations ranged from < 1 h to > 10 h (median = 1.3 h, mean = 2.7 h), with peak intensities typically occurring within the first hour. Maximum hourly precipitation reached 17.6 mm, and mean event intensities ranged from 0.07 to 10.8 mm h^{-1} (median = 0.43 mm h^{-1}), indicating that short, low-intensity events dominated the study period.

Table 2: Number of precipitation events by event intensity category for each period

	Maintenance Apr–Oct 2022	**First Succession** Nov 2022–Feb 2023	**Second Succession** Mar 2023–Feb 2024	**Target** Sep–Nov 2022
Light	23	20	56	19
Medium	27	14	54	14
Heavy	13	0	19	3
Violent	1	0	1	0
Total	**64**	**34**	**130**	**36**

2.6 Data analysis

All analyses were performed in R version 4.3.1 (R Core Team, 2025). Shapiro–Wilk and Levene's tests were used to assess normality and homoscedasticity. As the data did not meet these assumptions, non-parametric methods were applied where appropriate. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$, and mean values are reported ± standard error. Data visualization was conducted with the R packages ggplot2 (Wickham, 2016) and based on wesanderson (Karthik et al., 2018).

2.6.1 Topsoil moisture response times

As a preliminary step, we assessed how consistently precipitation events triggered measurable topsoil moisture responses by quantifying the proportion of sensors that showed no increase in topsoil moisture ("non-response") across all events between April 2022 and February 2024.

Building on this assessment, we tested whether moss restoration affects topsoil-moisture response dynamics following precipitation events by quantifying two metrics: the initial response time (IRT) and the peak response time (PRT). These metrics are based on established approaches for soil moisture response analysis (Kim, 2009; Singh et al., 2021; da Silva-Dias

et al., 2024). The IRT represents the interval between the onset of precipitation and the first non-random increase in topsoil moisture, whereas the PRT denotes the time elapsed from precipitation onset to the subsequent peak topsoil moisture value. For each sensor, a reference topsoil moisture (SM_{ref}) was defined as the median value within the 60 minutes preceding precipitation onset (t_{e_onset}). The initial topsoil moisture response was identified as the first increase exceeding 0.005 $m^3\ m^{-3}$ relative to SM_{ref}, occurring during precipitation or within three hours after the event. The threshold of 0.005 $m^3\ m^{-3}$ was chosen to exceed background fluctuations arising from natural variability or measurement noise. The initial response time (IRT, in minutes) was calculated as:

$$IRT = t_{e,ir} - t_{e,onset}$$

where $t_{e,onset}$ is the time of precipitation onset, and $t_{e,ir}$ is the time of the initial response in topsoil moisture.

IRT values were set to NA if any of the following criteria were met: all six 10-minute measurements of the reference topsoil moisture (SM_{ref}) were missing, the first 30 minutes of the precipitation contained only missing values, or no response above the threshold occurred within the precipitation event and subsequent three-hour period.

Preliminary data inspection revealed that precipitation events with < 2 mm within the first 60 min did not produce a measurable increase in topsoil moisture in that hour. Such "slow-start" events distort initial response time (IRT) and were therefore excluded from the IRT analysis. In addition, precipitation events with an intensity below 0. 5 mm h^{-1} (light drizzle) did not generate detectable topsoil moisture changes and were likewise filtered out prior to analysis. The peak response time (PRT, in minutes) was defined as:

$$PRT = t_{peak} - t_{e,onset}$$

Where t_{peak} is the timestamp of the maximum topsoil moisture observed during the precipitation or within the following 600 minutes, or until the next precipitation event if it occurred sooner.

Precipitation events with intensities below 0.5 mm were excluded from the analysis, consistent with the IRT filtering criteria. However, "slow-start" events were retained, as their influence on PRT is minimal given that the topsoil moisture peak typically occurs after the precipitation maximum. To test the effects of moss restoration on IRT and PRT, linear mixed-effects models (LMMs) were applied. In the base model, treatment was included as a fixed effect and date as a random effect to account for repeated measures. Extended models included precipitation intensity as an additional fixed effect, as well as its interaction with treatment, to assess whether the effect of moss restoration varied with precipitation intensity. Pairwise comparisons were performed using estimated marginal means (emmeans) with Bonferroni correction to adjust for multiple testing.

2.6.2 Daily topsoil moisture and drying rate

To assess whether moss restoration maintains higher topsoil moisture by slowing post-precipitation drying compared to bare soil and grass, daily topsoil moisture (SM) dynamics were analysed and drying rates were calculated. Daily SM values were

modelled using a generalized additive mixed model (GAMM) with treatment as a fixed effect and a random intercept for each sensor to account for repeated measurements. Non-linear smooth terms were included for each treatment to capture seasonal and long-term temporal trends across the study period. Data were aggregated to daily means per sensor to reduce temporal autocorrelation and computational demand.

Drying rates were calculated individually for each replicate over the 24-hour period following the topsoil-moisture peak (from precipitation onset to the SM maximum). If another precipitation occurred within this 24-hour window, the drying rate for that replicate was set to NA. For each event, the median drying rate across the four replicates per treatment was calculated. Only events with valid medians for all treatments were retained, resulting in 135 events. Differences among treatments were assessed using pairwise comparisons following a Kruskal–Wallis test, with significance determined via Dunn's test and Benjamini–Hochberg correction.

2.6.3 Topsoil moisture response under natural succession

To test whether differences in topsoil moisture response among moss restoration, grass, and bare soil diminish over time as natural succession progresses, we analysed changes in vegetation cover and temporal patterns of initial response time (IRT). Temporal dynamics in IRT were visualized using locally weighted regression (LOESS) smooths to capture non-linear seasonal and interannual variation. We used generalized additive models (GAMs) to analyse treatment effects on topsoil moisture response across discrete precipitation events. The models included treatment as a fixed factor and a non-linear smooth of month (numeric) for each treatment, allowing for treatment-specific monthly trends in IRT. Models were fitted using restricted maximum likelihood (REML).

3 Results

3.1 Natural succession of cover treatments

The following observations document the development of treatments and provide context for interpreting subsequent hypothesis-driven analyses.

During the **maintenance period** (April–October 2022), treatments remained functionally stable, with grass plots maintaining full (100%) vegetation cover, bare soil plots exhibiting a mean cover of 7.16%, and moss plots averaging 81.58% cover (Table 3). Moss plots experienced drying during April and June, with parts of the underlying jute fleece still visible and a temporary reduction in moss cover (Figure 2). By the end of the period, only one moss plot contained any grass (4% cover), indicating that, despite seasonal stress, mosses effectively prevented grass establishment.

Despite low temperatures and low global solar radiation during the **first succession period** (November 2022–February 2023; Figure 1), clear signs of colonization by grasses were visible in both moss and bare plots. Between October and December,

vegetation cover in bare soil plots increased sharply from a mean of 11.25 % to 57.5 %. Moss plots remained more resistant, with grass cover reaching only 12,25% while mosses still occupied a mean of 61% of the surface (Table 3). Functional differences between treatments were still apparent at this stage.

Over the 11 months of the **second succession period** (March 2023–February 2024), vegetation cover in bare soil plots increased from 67.5 % to 91.5%, dominated by grass but also encompassing mosses (Figure 2). In moss plots, grass cover expanded from 19.25 % to 45.5%, while moss cover declined from 61.5 % to 29.75 % (Table 3). By this stage, functional differences between treatments had largely disappeared, and vegetation structure in moss and bare plots had converged towards that of the grass treatment. Monitoring was therefore concluded.

The **target period** (September–November 2022) captured the phase in which treatments were functionally most distinct. During this period, moss plots exhibited high vitality, as indicated by their green colouration (Figure 2), while vegetation cover in bare soil plots remained minimal (Table 3), providing optimal conditions for assessing treatment effects.

Table 3: Vegetation cover (in %) for all replicates (Rep.) and treatments (bare, grass, moss) across the study period from February 2022 to February 2024. For moss treatments, total vegetation cover (value outside brackets) is differentiated between moss (first value in brackets) and grass (second value in brackets), where the values indicate the percentage of the total plot area.

	2022				2023	2024
Rep.	**April**	**June**	**October**	**December**	**March**	**February**
				bare		
1	4	6	10	46	65	79
2	3	2	8	47	45	90
3	10	6	20	78	79	97
4	6	4	7	59	81	98
Mean	**5.75**	**4.5**	**11.25**	**57.5**	**67.5**	**91.5**
				grass		
1	100	100	100	100	100	97
2	100	100	100	100	100	90
3	100	100	100	100	100	97
4	100	100	100	100	100	98
Mean	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**95.5**
				moss		
1	91	81	(78 + 4) 82	71	(77 + 6) 83	(21 + 44) 65
2	83	67	82	(45 + 20) 65	(46 + 33) 79	(38 + 54) 92
3	91	87	94	(86 + 10) 96	(73 + 23) 96	(30 + 46) 76
4	96	60	65	(42 + 19) 61	(50 + 15) 65	(30 + 42) 72
Mean	**90.25**	**73.75**	(79.75 + 1) **80.75**	(61 + 12.25) **73.25**	(61,5 + 19.25) **80.75**	(29,75 + 45.5) **75.5**



Figure 3: Example of the cover treatment development over the study period (April 2022–February 2024). Photos show replicate number 3 of bare, grass and moss treatments.

3.2 Topsoil moisture response times

Topsoil-moisture responsiveness varied strongly with precipitation intensity and surface treatment. Non-response rates declined markedly with increasing precipitation intensity across all treatments. During light precipitation, non-response was most frequent under grass (36.7%), compared with bare soil (11.1%) and moss (11.1%). Under moderate precipitation, non-response occurred in 19.5% of grass sensors, 5.9% of bare soil sensors, and 6.8% of moss sensors. Heavy precipitation further reduced non-response to 14.1% in grass, 0.9% in bare soil, and 0% in moss. During violent precipitation events, non-response was observed only in grass (12.5%), while both bare soil and moss exhibited complete responses (0%). Pairwise contrasts of estimated response probabilities from the binomial GLMM confirmed that grass differed significantly from both moss ($p < 0.0001$) and bare soil ($p < 0.0001$), whereas moss and bare soil did not differ significantly ($p = 0.10$).

Initial response time (IRT) differed significantly among treatments across the full dataset (Figure 3), following the pattern grass > moss > bare soil, with grass showing the longest IRT, moss intermediate, and bare soil the shortest (grass vs. moss $p < 0.0001$; grass vs. bare soil $p < 0.0001$; moss vs. bare soil $p = 0.253$). When analysed by period, significant treatment effects were detected during the maintenance period (Apr–Oct 2022) between bare soil and grass ($p = 0.022$) and between grass and moss ($p = 0.048$). In the first succession period (Nov 2022–Feb 2023), grass again exhibited longer IRT than both moss and bare soil ($p < 0.0001$ for both), with moss also exceeding bare soil ($p = 0.044$). During the second succession period (Mar 2023–Feb 2024), grass maintained significantly higher IRT than moss and bare soil ($p < 0.0001$ for both), while moss and bare

soil did not differ (p = 1). In the target period (Sep–Nov 2022), grass again exceeded both moss and bare soil (p < 0.0001 for both), with no significant difference between moss and bare soil (p = 1).

IRT generally declined with increasing precipitation intensity, with light events producing the slowest responses, followed by moderate and heavy events. This pattern was most pronounced during the maintenance period, when all event categories were present. IRT during light events was significantly longer than during heavy events (p = 0.0002), and moderate events also responded more slowly than heavy ones (p = 0.01). In the first succession period, only light and moderate events occurred, and their IRTs did not differ significantly (p = 0.162). During the second succession period, when all event categories were recorded, IRTs were significantly longer during moderate events than during heavy events (p = 0.005). In the target period, when light, moderate, and heavy events occurred, light precipitation events again showed significantly slower responses than moderate ones (p = 0.009). Differences involving violent events were not significant in any period, likely due to their low frequency (Table 2).

The difference between grass and moss or bare soil was most pronounced under light and moderate events (all p < 0.001), and remains significant, but less strong, under heavy events (grass > bare p = 0.0022; grass > moss p = 0.0004). The IRT of moss and bare soil converged with increasing intensity but never differed significantly (light: p = 0363, moderate p = 0.592, heavy p =1).




Figure 4: Initial response time (IRT) by treatment and period during the study. Results are from a linear mixed model (LMM) with treatment as fixed effect and date as random effect. Boxplots display the median (central line), interquartile range (boxes), and 1.5× IQR whiskers; outliers beyond this range are shown as individual points. Values above 300 were excluded from the figure for visualization purposes but were retained in all statistical analyses. Significant pairwise differences based on emmeans with Bonferroni fitting are indicated in the figure.

Peak response time (PRT) differed among treatments across the full dataset regardless of precipitation intensity (Figure 4). Grass reached peak topsoil moisture significantly faster than bare soil ($p = 0.0005$) and moss ($p < 0.0001$), whereas moss and bare do not differ significantly. When analysed by defined periods, treatment differences were only evident during the second succession period. In this period, grass exhibited significantly faster PRT than bare soil ($p = 0.0001$) and moss ($p < 0.0001$), while moss and bare soil again did not differ significantly.

PRT generally varied with precipitation intensity, though temporal patterns were less consistent than for IRT. Over the entire study period, light and moderate events showed the longest PRTs, with no significant difference between them, and both were significantly longer than heavy events (light > heavy, $p = 0.0002$; moderate > heavy, $p < 0.0001$). Violent events had the shortest PRTs, but observed differences to light ($p = 0.0036$) and moderate ($p = 0.0014$) events should be interpreted cautiously due to low number of events (Table 2). During the maintenance period, moderate events had the longest PRT of all intensity categories. It was significantly longer than under light ($p < 0.0001$) and heavy events ($p < 0.0001$). Other pairwise comparisons were not significant. During the first succession period, light events had significantly longer PRT than moderate events ($p < 0.0001$). During the second succession period, there was no significant difference between the PRT of light and moderate events. Light events had longer PRT than heavy ($p = 0.008$) and violent events ($p = 0.002$), while moderate events had longer PRT than heavy ($p = 0.027$) and violent events ($p = 0.0064$). During the target period, the PRT of moderate events was again significantly longer than that of light and heavy events (both $p < 0.0001$), the latter two were no different from each other.

Differences between treatments within precipitation event categories were only found under light and heavy events. During light events, grass showed significantly longer PRT than bare soil ($p = 0.0049$) and moss ($p = 0.007$), whereas bare and moss did not differ significantly ($p = 1$). During moderate events, no significant differences between treatments were observed (all $p > 0.1$). For heavy events, grass again had the longest PRT, differing significantly from moss ($p < 0.0001$) and bare soil ($p = 0.0032$), while moss and bare soil remained similar ($p = 1$). No significant differences between treatments were detected during violent events, likely reflecting the limited number of violent events recorded ($n = 2$).




Figure 5: Peak response time (PRT) by treatment and period during the study. Results are from a linear mixed model (LMM) with treatment as fixed effect and date as random effect. Boxplots display the median (central line), interquartile range (boxes), and 1.5× IQR whiskers; outliers beyond this range are shown as individual points. Values above 1400 were excluded from the figure for visualization purposes but were retained in all statistical analyses. Significant pairwise differences based on emmeans with Bonferroni fitting are indicated.

3.3 Mean topsoil moisture and drying rate

To assess whether moss restoration maintains higher topsoil moisture through slower drying compared to bare soil and grass, we analysed topsoil moisture dynamics across the three treatments, focusing on both mean moisture and drying rates. Topsoil moisture exhibited strong seasonal patterns, with lower values in summer and higher values in autumn and winter, and pronounced non-linear temporal variation across all treatments (Figure 5). GAMM results indicated no significant differences between treatments over the full study period from April 2022 to February 2024 (all $p > 0.1$). Using bare soil as a reference, significant differences were observed only during the maintenance period (April–October 2022), when grass plots had slightly lower topsoil moisture than bare soil ($p = 0.03$). Although not statistically significant, the trend continues in the second succession period (March 2023–February 2024), with bare soil maintaining the highest mean soil moisture (Figure 6).

Across all periods, between-sensor variability was consistently significant (random effect, $p < 2 \times 10^{-16}$), indicating systematic differences among measurement locations, while the GAMM models explained 84–92 % of the deviance. Overall, temporal variation and seasonal trends had a much stronger influence on topsoil moisture than treatment effects, and differences between treatments were relatively minor.




Figure 6: Predicted daily mean volumetric soil moisture over study period (April 2022 – Feb 2024) for each treatment (bare, grass, moss), estimated from a generalized additive mixed model (GAMM). Random effects of individual sensors were excluded in the visualization to show population-level trends.




Figure 7: Volumetric topsoil moisture of the three treatments across four periods: maintenance (April–October 2022), first succession (November 2022–February 2023), second succession (March 2023–February 2024), and target period (September–November 2022. Significant differences between treatments derived from a generalized additive mixed model (GAMM), are indicated with p-values for selected pairwise comparisons.

To test whether moss slows topsoil drying compared to bare soil and grass, drying rates were calculated over 24 h following the topsoil moisture peak. Pairwise comparisons of median 24 h drying rates (Figure 7) revealed significant differences among treatments, following the pattern moss ≈ bare > grass. Drying rates were higher in moss than in grass ($p < 0.0001$) and higher in bare soil than in grass ($p = 0.0009$), while drying rates did not differ significantly between bare soil and moss ($p = 1$).

When extended to a 72-h drying window, the overall pattern (moss ≈ bare > grass) persisted, but differences were no longer statistically significant. The reduced number of events with a full 72-h drying period (65 events) likely limited statistical power compared to the 24-h analysis (135 events).




Figure 8: Median 24 h topsoil moisture drying rates by treatment across the study. Boxplots show the median (central line), interquartile range (boxes), and 1.5× IQR whiskers; outliers beyond this range are shown as individual points. Only events with valid data for all treatments (135 events) are included. Significant pairwise differences were assessed using Kruskal–Wallis followed by Dunn's tests with Benjamini–Hochberg correction; p-values are indicated in the figure.

3.4 Topsoil moisture response under natural succession

The generalized additive model (GAM) revealed strong nonlinear seasonal patterns in initial response time (IRT), which differed among treatments and aligned with the LOESS visualization (Figure 8). Across the full dataset, grass showed the longest overall IRT, while bare soil and moss responded faster (parametric terms: grass > moss > bare, all $p < 0.0001$). Temporal variability of IRT was most pronounced in grass $p < 0.0001$), followed by moss ($p < 0.009$), while bare soil exhibited weaker but still significant seasonal fluctuations ($p = 0.017$). Overall, the model explained about 11% of the variation in IRT,

suggesting that treatment and seasonality together contributed modest but significant effects to the timing of topsoil moisture responses.

The most pronounced difference occurred between grass and bare soil, emerging in September 2022 ($p = 0.004$) and remaining highly significant from October 2022 to December 2023 ($p < 0.0001$), before gradually declining in early 2024 (January $p = 0.0008$; February $p = 0.0453$). The grass–moss contrast followed a similar pattern, becoming significant in September 2022 and persisting until January 2024 (September 2022 – December 2023 $p = 0.0009$, January ($p = 0.0018$). Differences between bare and moss were limited, occurring only in December 2022 ($p = 0.035$) and January 2023 ($p = 0.0317$). It should be noted that data from April 2022 and February 2024 represent only partial months, resulting in a reduced number of observations.




Figure 9: Monthly initial topsoil moisture response time (IRT) for the three treatments (bare, grass, and moss) over the study period (14 April 2022 – 20 February 2024). Lines represent locally weighted regression (LOESS) smooths (span = 0.2) of the mean IRT per month.

Variability in IRT remained low and similar among treatments during the early study period but diverged in later periods. Across the maintenance period (April–October 2022), variability did not differ among treatments (Levene's $p = 0.424$). In the first succession period (November 2022–February 2023), grass exhibited greater dispersion than moss and bare soil, with variance differences reaching significance ($p = 0.020$). Variability further diverged during the second succession period (March 2023–February 2024), with significant differences among treatments ($p < 0.001$) and grass showing the highest variance. In the target period (September–November 2022), differences in variability were also significant ($p = 0.017$), primarily driven by the higher dispersion under grass. These temporal patterns suggest that the heterogeneity of IRT increased over time, particularly under grass cover.

4 Discussion

4.1 Natural succession of cover treatments

Discussing the natural succession of treatments provides essential context for interpreting topsoil moisture responses.

Grass establishment in bare-soil plots resumed rapidly after maintenance ceased, likely reflecting favourable late-autumn conditions, including mild temperatures and high humidity, as well as reduced disturbance following the harvest. Similar growth responses of *Lolium perenne*, the dominant species in our grass treatment, under moist and mild conditions have been reported by Celette et al. (2008), although primarily for spring growth.

Moss plots initially suppressed grass colonization, consistent with findings summarized by Qu et al. (2023), who reported that mosses can inhibit seed germination and early seedling establishment. Grass gradually expanded over subsequent months, while moss cover declined; however, mosses persisted for over a year, highlighting their ability to maintain dominance under limited disturbance. These dynamics indicate that mosses can delay grass colonization during early succession but are ultimately outcompeted over time.

Seasonal and environmental conditions further shaped these patterns. Mosses remained green and vigorous throughout winter, likely supported by persistently high relative humidity, moderate temperatures and limited solar radiation exposure, which reduce desiccation stress (Figure 1 and 2). This underscores the importance of moisture availability and microclimatic buffering for moss persistence under field conditions.

By the end of the experiment, functional differences between all treatments had largely converged, with bare-soil plots recolonized by grasses and moss plots containing a mixed cover. This convergence demonstrates that moss restoration can persist for extended periods but may require occasional interventions, such as selective grass removal or seasonal trimming, to maintain long-term dominance and achieve desired under-vine management outcomes.

The observed succession patterns highlight that moss restoration outcomes are strongly influenced by environmental conditions and management practices. While the present study provides insights into moss persistence and associated soil moisture responses under the investigated vineyard conditions, further studies across contrasting climates, soil types, and management systems are needed to evaluate the transferability of these findings. In addition, the feasibility of implementing pre-cultivated moss mats at larger spatial scales, including full under-vine or between-row coverage, are subject to further investigation.

4.2 Topsoil moisture response times

Our results support the hypothesis that moss restoration does not significantly delay topsoil moisture response times after precipitation events. While grass cover slowed both initial and peak response times, moss treatments showed only minor delays compared to bare soil, indicating that moss did not impede infiltration under the conditions of this study.

To analyse response times accurately, it was necessary to exclude non-response events. Such thresholds are common: Silva-Dias et al. (2024) reported topsoil moisture responses only above 1.2 mm h^{-1}, whereas in our study the threshold was much lower (< 0.5 mm h^{-1}). This highlights the importance of determining site-specific thresholds in future studies to ensure meaningful interpretation of topsoil moisture dynamics.

Initial response times (IRT) differed consistently among treatments, indicating that vegetation structure modulates the onset of infiltration. This supports our hypothesis that moss restoration does not significantly delay topsoil moisture response, even though vegetation cover per se can slow infiltration. Similar observations under high-intensity precipitation have been reported in experimental studies, where mosses did not act as a barrier to infiltration (Li et al., 2016; Thielen et al., 2021; Zi et al. (2026)). The delayed response under grass likely reflects an interception effect, where dense vegetation prevents precipitation from reaching the soil surface, thereby delaying infiltration (Bodner et al., 2008; Huang et al. 2023; Silva-Dias et al., 2024).

At the same time, the influence of moss on infiltration is context dependent. Previous work has demonstrated that infiltration responses reflect not only surface cover but also underlying soil structure, with well-developed, stable topsoil horizons promoting rapid infiltration irrespective of vegetation type (Leonard and Andrieux, 1998). Reviews of biocrusts further emphasize that moss-dominated surfaces can either enhance or inhibit infiltration depending on coverage, thickness, and developmental stage, with early or less dense crusts generally facilitating water entry (Ya et al., 2025). In the present study, the moss was applied as cushion-like mats rather than compact crusts, which may partly explain the absence of infiltration delays observed here. Experimental and modelling studies confirm this complexity, identifying crust thickness, organic matter content, and biocrust maturity as key controls, with infiltration rates often declining as moss-dominated crusts become more developed (Yang et al., 2025; Zhao et al., 2025).

Precipitation intensity further modulated IRT across treatments, with faster responses under higher intensities, consistent with threshold-like infiltration behaviour. Similar intensity-dependent effects have been reported for biocrusts, where moss-dominated surfaces can enhance infiltration during prolonged, low-intensity precipitation but reduce it during short, high-intensity events (Ju et al., 2024). More generally, precipitation characteristics often outweigh vegetation effects in controlling soil moisture response, particularly under variable antecedent conditions (Zhang et al., 2022). Together, these findings indicate that while moss restoration does not delay initial topsoil moisture response under the conditions studied here, its hydrological role is contingent on both precipitation and plant development.

Peak response times (PRT) were generally longest under grass, while moss and bare soil exhibited similarly rapid peaks, further supporting the hypothesis that moss restoration does not substantially delay topsoil moisture responses following precipitation. These differences indicate that vegetation structure influences not only the onset but also the temporal evolution of topsoil moisture dynamics.

The delayed peak observed under grass likely arises from mechanisms similar to those influencing initial response times. Although grass has been shown to reduce surface runoff compared to bare soil (Rodrigo Comino et al., 2016; Duan et al.,

2022; Gall et al., 2025), dense aboveground biomass and surface residues may temporarily reduce water entry into the soil. In contrast, grass root systems can enhance soil structure by increasing porosity and infiltration capacity over time (Duan et al., 2022).

The delayed peak observed under grass likely reflects altered infiltration and redistribution processes induced by the grass root system. Although grass cover generally reduces surface runoff compared to bare soil (Rodrigo Comino et al., 2016; Duan et al., 2022; Gall et al., 2025), root architecture can influence the dominant water flow pathways by modifying soil porosity, infiltration capacity, and preferential flow development (Duan et al., 2022, Duan et al. 2026). Moss restoration has likewise been shown to reduce surface runoff (Xiao et al., 2015; Tu et al., 2022; Gall et al., 2025), but due to mosses' poikilohydric characteristics and lack of deep rooting systems (Proctor et al., 1998), infiltration processes differ fundamentally from those under grass cover.

PRT generally varied with precipitation intensity, but temporal patterns were less consistent than for IRT, partly due to unexpectedly high estimates for moderate events during the maintenance period. This variability may also reflect the inherent complexity of soil moisture response dynamics, as emphasized by Silva-Dias et al. (2024), who showed that the magnitude and timing of soil moisture responses can represent partly independent processes. To our knowledge, studies explicitly focusing on peak response times in moss-dominated systems are lacking, which limits broader generalization of the observed patterns.

Across both IRT and PRT, our ability to assess extreme precipitation is limited because only two violent events occurred during the study. This is an inherent constraint of field experiments relying on natural precipitation. Targeted precipitation simulations could help determine whether extreme storms override vegetation effects or amplify differences between treatments.

4.3 Mean topsoil moisture and drying rate

Results show that moss restoration does not increase topsoil moisture through slower drying and our second hypothesis was thus rejected. Mean topsoil moisture did not differ significantly among treatments, except during the maintenance period, when grass plots exhibited slightly lower values than bare soil. Although not significant, this pattern re-emerged during the second succession period (March 2023–February 2024).

Although bare soil lacks protective cover and would therefore be expected to dry more rapidly, the absence of vascular vegetation and associated plant water uptake may counterbalance enhanced evaporative losses, resulting in higher mean topsoil moisture. This interpretation is consistent with findings by Capri et al. (2023), who showed that grasses generally exhibit the highest daily water uptake due to evapotranspiration, but that mowing can substantially reduce water use, in some cases to levels below those of bare soil. Similarly, Monteiro and Lopes (2007) observed higher topsoil moisture in tilled vineyard soils compared to plots with resident vegetation or sown cover crops, which they attributed to reduced transpiration and interception

losses. Together, these results highlight that vegetation effects on topsoil moisture reflect a balance between surface protection and plant water uptake rather than vegetation cover alone.

Comparisons with other studies show that the hydrological role of mosses is highly site-dependent, influenced by soil structure and climate. Hu et al. (2023) found that in alpine forest soils, bare surfaces retained more moisture than moss cover in the upper 0–10 cm, whereas moss increased retention at 10–30 cm depth, raising the question of whether the higher surface moisture in our bare plots might invert at greater depths. In contrast, Lulu and Dongdong (2025) reported that in karst soils, moss establishment reduced surface evaporation by 48–72% and increased water storage by 11–22%, partly through surface sealing within the top 5 cm. In addition, Li et al. (2026) recently demonstrated that moss carpets grown in a greenhouse on burlap increased soil moisture by 16.11% at a depth of 10 cm when planted in the field on an aeolian sandy soil in comparison with a bare soil control.

Drying rates followed the pattern moss ≈ bare > grass. Contrary to our expectations, grass did not exhibit the fastest drying despite its active root system; instead, moss and bare soil dried more rapidly. This pattern suggests that grass primarily accesses water from deeper soil layers beyond the 14 cm measurement depth, while its dense vegetation cover reduces direct soil evaporation. This interpretation is consistent with findings by Liu et al. (2020), who identified root length density at 5–30 cm depth and root surface area at 10–20 cm depth as key factors influencing infiltration rates, indicating that root effects on soil hydraulic processes are strongly depth-dependent. Similar depth-dependent root activity has been observed in vineyards by Celette et al. (2008), who reported that a perennial cover including *Lolium perenne*, the dominant species in our cover crop (grass), concentrates most of its roots within the upper 0.5 m but can extend down to 1 m. This rooting strategy enables efficient water uptake from deeper layers while simultaneously limiting near-surface drying through shading and reduced evaporation.

In contrast, the higher drying rates observed under moss and bare soil indicate a stronger coupling between the soil surface and the atmosphere. Rice et al. (2018) showed that moss layers are thermally structured, with cooler shoot tips creating vertical temperature gradients. Moreover, coupling with the atmosphere is strong when mosses are wet but weak when dry, and the structural characteristics have a greater influence on these dynamics than species identity. The size and surface roughness of moss cushions may create a threshold beyond which further increases in roughness either enhance or restrict water loss, with the leaf area-to-volume ratio reflecting the balance between evaporative surface and water storage capacity (Rice and Schneider, 2004). In our study, this suggests a high fluctuation in water storage within the moss treatments over time, as mosses were visibly dry in early 2022 (April and June; see 3.2), yet topsoil moisture beneath moss remained similar to that under grass and lower than bare soil. Controlled laboratory experiments could help disentangle the specific mechanisms by which moss traits, such as structure, roughness, and vitality, affect topsoil moisture, independent of other environmental factors.

In parallel, interactions between ground vegetation and grapevine root systems further complicate soil moisture dynamics. Although grapevines generally develop deeper root systems, grasses can still compete for water in superficial soil layers (Smart et al., 2006; Lehnart et al., 2008; Lanari et al., 2025). Grass cover has been shown to reduce vine root density near the surface

while promoting deeper rooting, resulting in vertical root stratification that may partially alleviate competition in upper soil horizons (Lanari et al., 2025). However, because grapevines access water across all soil compartments, competition for shallow soil moisture can still be substantial (Celette et al., 2008). These interactions are likely to become most critical during drought periods or at sites with limited deep soil water reserves, underscoring the need to integrate both above- and below-ground processes when evaluating vegetation-mediated soil moisture regulation in vineyards.

4.4 Topsoil moisture response under natural succession

The hypothesis that differences in topsoil moisture response between moss restoration, grass, and bare soil diminish over time after maintenance ended is only partially supported. While vegetation cover clearly converged, as discussed in 4.1, topsoil moisture dynamics tell a more nuanced story, with treatment-specific responses persisting in certain periods.

Monthly comparisons of initial response time (IRT) showed that significant treatment differences only emerged after September 2022. At first, this may seem counterintuitive, since all treatments were actively maintained from April to October 2022, and the strongest contrasts might have been expected during this period. However, as detailed in Gall et al. (2025), moss establishment progressed more slowly than anticipated due to unusually hot and dry conditions during summer 2022, which delayed jute mat disintegration and hindered moss development.

The delayed divergence of IRT between bare soil and grass prior to September remains unclear, as both were expected to be fully established from the outset. Bare soil plots were prepared through careful weeding and cutting of existing vegetation, suggesting that residual grass roots might have persisted. However, all treatments were installed two months before the start of the experiment to minimize such legacy effects. While a longer establishment period might have further reduced residual influences, this alone does not fully explain the absence of early-season differences. A more likely factor is the hot and dry weather (see 2.1), which generated high evaporative demand and may have masked treatment-specific topsoil moisture responses. Seasonal variation in vineyard soil moisture is also strongly influenced by vine phenology: Monteiro & Lopes (2007) reported that soil moisture declines sharply from budbreak to harvest due to increasing vine water uptake. This pattern aligns with our volumetric topsoil moisture data (Figure 7), which declined across all treatments from May to July/August, potentially obscuring early-season differences and explaining why significant treatment effects in response times only appeared after September.

Variability in topsoil moisture response revealed a clear pattern: moss plots consistently exhibited the lowest dispersion in IRT throughout the study, reflected in narrow standard deviations and interquartile ranges. In contrast, grass plots displayed higher variability, reaching significance during the first succession period (November 2022–February 2023) and remaining elevated thereafter. This likely reflects seasonal fluctuations in grass root water uptake driven by growth dynamics, mowing, and environmental conditions (Capri et al., 2023; Celette et al., 2008), whereas mosses, being poikilohydric and lacking true roots, maintain more consistent water absorption and release via rhizoids (Proctor et al., 1998). For vineyard management, this

suggests that moss restoration not only imposes minimal infiltration barriers but also promotes more stable and predictable soil moisture dynamics, highlighting its potential as a reliable under-vine ground cover.

To summarize, vegetation cover clearly converged, and by February 2024, bare soil and moss treatments no longer exhibited their distinct characteristics, justifying the termination of the experiment. However, topsoil moisture responses only began to show signs of hydrological convergence toward the end of the study. Extending the experiment by several months could have clarified whether these differences would have continued to diminish, providing a more definitive test of the hypothesis and offering deeper insight into the temporal dynamics of vegetation-mediated topsoil moisture under natural succession.

4.5 Limitations of scale, subsurface processes, and transferability

Our findings should be interpreted with an understanding of the spatial scale and measurement approach underlying them, as these factors constrain the extent to which the findings can be transferred to larger spatial scales. First, the 40 × 40 cm plots and point-scale TMS-4 dataloggers, positioned at consistent locations relative to the vine row, characterize topsoil moisture dynamics at a specific microsite. They do not capture spatial variability in throughfall, stemflow, and infiltration across the row or hillslope. Therefore, our results should be interpreted as evidence of treatment effects at this scale rather than a scaled estimate of vineyard-wide hydrologic response.

Second, undocumented subsurface processes may also shape the patterns we observed. The gentle slope of 5° and textural similarity between the 0–25 and 25–90 cm horizons at the study site make pronounced lateral interflow at the horizon boundary unlikely to dominate the results. However, lateral subsurface flow has been shown to constitute a substantial component of total flow even on comparable or steeper slopes, with its magnitude strongly dependent on land use (Teschemacher et al., 2019). Particularly in vineyard soils on steep slopes, subsurface runoff and the associated transport of particles were identified as an important pathway distinct from surface runoff (Kögler et al., 2025), underscoring that such processes cannot be dismissed even where topography is comparatively gentle. The low topsoil bulk density (0.96 g cm^{-3}) and clay-rich texture at our study site are further consistent with the potential for macropore and preferential flow pathways that point measurements with the TMS-4 dataloggers cannot resolve. Since TMS-4 dataloggers provide a single integrated moisture value for a small volume of soil around the probe (Wild et al., 2019), they cannot distinguish whether a particular reading reflects water stored in the soil matrix or water that has flowed through or accumulated in macropores. Depending on the exact position of the sensor relative to biopores or root channels, this can lead to additional, unresolved variations between replicates within a treatment and distort comparisons of moisture response times, independent of the actual treatment effects.

Third, while moss persisted with minimal management once established in our study, the wider literature suggests that this outcome is not yet reliably low-maintenance. Bu et al. (2018) achieved >90% moss coverage on a 15° slope, but required sustained soil moisture, weekly nutrient application, and 70% summer shading. Fan et al. (2025) achieved 55% coverage after 90 days on a steeper (60°) stony slope, but required daily irrigation and weekly nutrient application. Similarly, Li et al. (2026)

demonstrated successful field establishment of prefabricated moss carpets, although intensive initial maintenance was required. These studies indicate that moss establishment is feasible under challenging conditions, but remains maintenance-intensive during establishment. Thus, low-maintenance establishment and persistence under realistic vineyard management have yet to be demonstrated, warranting further research on the scalability of moss-based applications.

5 Conclusion

This study evaluated moss restoration as an under-vine soil management strategy in a temperate vineyard, focusing on soil moisture dynamics, drying behaviour, and vegetation succession.

1. Moss restoration did not significantly delay initial or peak topsoil moisture response times following precipitation. Across the full dataset, IRT followed the pattern grass > moss > bare soil and generally declined with increasing precipitation intensity. Peak response times showed a similar trend (grass > bare ≈ moss), though the influence of precipitation intensity was less consistent.
2. Mean topsoil moisture did not differ significantly among treatments, with a tendency toward slightly higher values in bare soil plots, likely reflecting faster short-term infiltration rather than greater moisture retention capacity. Drying rates followed the pattern moss ≈ bare > grass, indicating stronger coupling of moss and bare surfaces to atmospheric evaporative demand compared with grass-covered soils.
3. Moss plots initially suppressed grass establishment more effectively than bare soil, while maintaining continuous vegetation cover during this period, but this advantage diminished during the second growing season. Vegetation cover indicated progressive convergence of treatments, bare soil plots reached over 90% coverage by the end of the study, yet convergence in topsoil moisture response dynamics had only begun to emerge, reflecting a temporal lag between vegetation development and hydrological effects.

Overall, moss restoration did not impede infiltration and maintained topsoil moisture dynamics comparable to bare soil, while providing continuous soil cover without the need for chemical or mechanical weed control. Compared with bare soil, moss cover may additionally reduce soil exposure and erosion and support a more stable and biologically active soil surface. Together, these findings indicate that moss restoration has potential as an under-vine groundcover option, particularly in areas with limited traffic.

However, these benefits should be interpreted within the spatial and experimental scale of this study. Our measurements captured treatment effects at a defined microsite and do not account for spatial heterogeneity in hydrological processes across vine rows or hillslopes. Moreover, the persistence and low-maintenance establishment of moss observed here may not be readily transferable to other vineyard environments, particularly those differing in climate, soil conditions, slope, or disturbance regime. Thus, while our results provide evidence for the feasibility of moss restoration under the conditions tested, they do not yet demonstrate its suitability as a scalable vineyard-wide management practice.

Future research should focus on optimizing moss restoration strategies under a wider range of vineyard conditions. Species selection should consider both drought tolerance and local ecological conditions, as the species mix used in this study comprised taxa from diverse habitats with varying stress tolerance (Atherton et al., 2010; Nebel et al., 2000; Proctor et al., 2007). Incorporating more stress-tolerant species may improve persistence under increasing climatic extremes (Proctor et al., 2007; Li et al., 2024), while selection should remain aligned with local ecological and soil conditions to support successful establishment. In addition, refinement of installation methods, including substrate selection and fragment stabilization, may further enhance establishment success (Doherty et al., 2020). Adaptive management approaches, such as temporary irrigation, shading, or suitable microhabitat selection, could support early establishment and improve long-term stability <under variable vineyard conditions (Bu et al., 2018; Antoninka et al., 2020; Glime, 2021).

With further optimization and testing across contrasting vineyard environments, moss restoration may provide an under-vine groundcover that reduces reliance on herbicides and mechanical weed control while protecting soil and potentially supporting soil biological functions. Its broader applicability and long-term maintenance requirements, however, remain to be established.

Acknowledgements

We sincerely thank Marc Jäger for generously granting access to his vineyard, which made this study possible. We are also grateful to Gert Joachim Aldinger and the Fellbacher Weingärtner eG for providing access to their facilities. Meteorological data were kindly supplied by Agrarmeteorologie Baden-Württemberg, with valuable assistance from Helge de Boer and Therese Hintemann. We further acknowledge Sabine Flaiz, Rita Mögenburg, and Peter Kühn for their support in the laboratory, and Hannah Schmidt for her guidance during data analysis.

This research has been funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG SE 2767/2-1, “MesiCrust”) and the Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture / Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection via Fachagentur Nachwachsende Rohstoffe e.V. (FNR 2220WK67A4, “AnKliMoos”).

Statements and Declarations

Competing interests. The contact author has declared that none of the authors has any competing interests.

Code availability. The codes used in this study are available on figshare: https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.31439944

Data availability. The dataset compiled and analysed in this study is available on figshare: https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.31438390

Author contribution. CG, StS and MN designed the experiment. SO, CG, and StS carried out field measurements. SO conducted data analyses and prepared the manuscript with contributions from all other co-authors.

References

Agrarmeteorologie Baden-Württemberg: Stundenwerte der Globalstrahlung und der relativen Luftfeuchtigkeit an der Wetterstation in Fellbach, Agrarmeteorologie Baden-Württemberg [data set], https://www.wetter-bw.de/Internet/AM/NotesBwAM.nsf/bwweb/353153acec539eb8c1257ca7003c1860?OpenDocument, (last access: 5 September 2025), 2025a.

Agrarmeteorologie Baden-Württemberg: Stundenwerte für Lufttemperatur (2m) und Niederschlag an der Wetterstation in Fellbach, Agrarmeteorologie Baden-Württemberg [data set], https://www.wetter-bw.de/Internet/AM/NotesBwAM.nsf/bwweb/353153acec539eb8c1257ca7003c1860?OpenDocument, (last access: 5 September 2025), 2025b.

Antoninka, A., Faist, A., Rodriguez-Caballero, E., Young, K. E., Chaudhary, V. B., Condon, L. A., and Pyke, D. A.: Biological soil crusts in ecological restoration: emerging research and perspectives, Restor. Ecol., 28, 150–59, https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.13201, 2020.

Atherton, I., Bosanquet, S., and Lawley, M.: Mosses and Liverworts of Britain and Ireland– A field guide, 1, British Bryological Society, Plymouth, ISBN 978-0-9561310-1-0, 2010.

Belnap, J., Kaltenecker, J. H., Rosentreter, R., Williams, J., Leonard, S., and Eldridge, D.: Biological soil crusts: ecology and management, US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado, https://www.ars.usda.gov/ARSUserFiles/6112/biologicalSoilCrusts2.pdf, (last access: 8 August 2024), 2001.

Belnap, J.: The potential roles of biological soil crusts in dryland hydrologic cycles, Hydrological Processes: An International Journal, 20(15), 3159–3178, https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.6325, 2006.

Biddoccu, M., Ferraris, S., Opsi, F., and Cavallo, E.: Longterm monitoring of soil management effects on runoff and soil erosion in sloping vineyards in Alto Monferrato (North–West Italy), Soil Tillage Res., 155, 176–189, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2015.07.005, 2016.

Bodner, G., Loiskandl, W., Buchan, G., and Kaul, H. P.: Natural and management-induced dynamics of hydraulic conductivity along a cover-cropped field slope, Geoderma, 146, 317–325, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2008.05.009, 2008.

Bu, C., Wu, S., Han, F., Yang, Y., and Meng, J.: The combined effects of moss-dominated biocrusts and vegetation on erosion and soil moisture and implications for disturbance on the Loess Plateau, China, Plos One, 10, e0127394, https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127394, 2015.

Bu, C., Li, R., Wang, C., and Bowker, M. A.: Successful field cultivation of moss biocrusts on disturbed soil surfaces in the short term, Plant Soil, 429, 227–240, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104017-3453-0, 2018.

Bundesamt für Kartographie und Geodäsie (BKG): WFS Verwaltungsgebiete 1:2 500 000, licence: dl-de/by-2-0, available at: https://gdz.bkg.bund.de/, last access: 23 June 2026.

Capri, C., Gatti, M., Fiorini, A., Ardenti, F., Tabaglio, V., and Poni, S.: A comparative study of fifteen cover crop species for orchard soil management: water uptake, root density traits and soil aggregate stability, Scientific Reports, 13, 721, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-27915-7, 2023.

Celette, F., Wery, J., Chantelot, E., Celette, J., and Gary, C.: Belowground interactions in a vine (Vitis vinifera L.) tall fescue (Festuca arundinacea Shreb.) intercropping system: water relations and growth, Plant Soil, 276, 205–217, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-005-4415-5, 2005.

Celette, F., Gaudin, R., and Gary, C.: Spatial and temporal changes to the water regime of a Mediterranean vineyard due to the adoption of cover cropping, Eur. J. Agron., 29, 153–162, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2008.05.001, 2008.

Corbin, J. D. and Thiet, R. K.: Temperate biocrusts: mesic counterparts to their better-known dryland cousins, Front. Ecol. Environ., 18, 456–464, https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.2234, 2020.

Cruz de Carvalho, R., Varela, Z., do Paço, T. A., and Branquinho, C.: Selecting potential moss species for green roofs in the Mediterranean Basin, Urban Sci., 3(2), 57, https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci3020057, 2019.

Da Silva-Dias, R., Raposo-Díaz, X., García-Tomillo, A., and López-Vicente, M.: Response time of soil moisture to rain in a vineyard with permanent cover, Geoderma, 444, 116866, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2024.116866, 2024.

Diago, M. P.: Vineyard water management, in: Advanced Automation for Tree Fruit Orchards and Vineyards, Agriculture Automation and Control, edited by Vougioukas, S. G. and Zhang, Q., Springer, Cham, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-26941-7_4, 2023.

Dittrich, F., Iserloh, T., Treseler, C.-H., Hüppi, R., Ogan, S., Seeger, M., and Thiele-Bruhn, S.: Crop diversification in viticulture with aromatic plants: effects of intercropping on grapevine productivity in a steep-slope vineyard in the Mosel area, Germany, Agriculture, 11, 95, https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture11020095, 2021.

Doherty, K. D., Grover, H. S., Bowker, M. A., Durham, R. A., Antoninka, A. J., and Ramsey, P. W.: Producing moss-colonized burlap fabric in a fog chamber for restoration of biocrust, Ecol. Eng., 158, 106019, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2020.106019, 2020.

Dollery, R., Bowie, M. H., and Dickinson, N. M.: The ecological importance of moss ground cover in dry shrubland restoration within an irrigated agricultural landscape matrix, Ecol. Evol., 12, e8843, https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.8843, 2022.

Duan, J., Liu, Y.-J., Wang, L.-Y., Yang, J., Tang, C.-J., and Zheng, H.-J.: Importance of grass stolons in mitigating runoff and sediment yield under simulated rainstorms, Catena, 213, 106132, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2022.106132, 2022.

Duan, J., Wang, L., Tang, C., Liu, Y., Zheng, H., and Yang, J.: Divergent effects of grass cover on soil infiltration patterns and water recharge in orchards: Taproot vs. fibrous root systems, Soil Tillage Res., 258, 107045, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2025.107045, 2026.

Deutscher Wetterdienst (DWD): Klimastatusbericht Deutschland Jahr 2022, DWD, Geschäftsbereich Klima und Umwelt, Offenbach, 27 pp., https://www.dwd.de/DE/der_DWD/bibliothek/fachpublikationen/selbstverlag/selbstverlag_node.html, (last access: 10 January 2026), 2023a.

Deutscher Wetterdienst (DWD): Deutschlandwetter im Jahr 2022 – Deutschland erlebt eines der zwei wärmsten Jahre und einen Sonnenscheinrekord, https://www.dwd.de/DE/presse/pressemitteilungen/DE/2022/20221230_deutschlandwetter_jahr2022.pdf;jsessionid=E94FDE4F6E53E8686CBAD046BDA9A0EF.live11043?__blob=publicationFile&v=3, (last access: 10 January 2026), 2022b.

Deutscher Wetterdienst (DWD): Klimastatusbericht Deutschland Jahr 2023, DWD, Geschäftsbereich Klima und Umwelt, Offenbach, 27 pp., https://www.dwd.de/DE/leistungen/klimastatusbericht/klimastatusbericht.html, (last access: 10 January 2026), 2024a.

Deutscher Wetterdienst (DWD): Deutschlandwetter im Jahr 2023 – Erwärmungstrend hält an: 2023 mit neuem Rekord und reichlich Niederschlag, https://www.dwd.de/DE/presse/pressemitteilungen/DE/2023/20231229_deutschlandwetter_jahr2023.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=4, (last access: 10 January 2026), 2023b.

Deutscher Wetterdienst (DWD): Niederschlagsintensität, https://www.dwd.de/DE/service/lexikon/Functions/glossar.html?lv3=101906&lv2=101812, (last access: 10 January 2026), 2026.

Fan, J., Wang, C., Bu, C., Chen, X., Wang, H., Mo, Q., Zhang, Z., Zeng, Y., and Li, H.: Key Factors for the Rapid Cultivation of Lithophytic Moss Crusts and Preliminary Trials in the Ecological Restoration of Rocky Slopes, Land Degrad. Dev., 36, 6125-6136, https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.70059, 2025.

Fischer, T., Kholiavko, T., Schaaf, W., and Veste, M.: Soil respiration responses of moss and lichen biocoenoses to moderate and severe rainfall events after summer drought in a temperate early-successional ecosystem, Ecohydrology, 16(7), e2578, https://doi.org/10.1002/eco.2578, 2023.

Gall, C., Nebel, M., Quandt, D., Scholten, T., and Seitz, S.: Pioneer biocrust communities prevent soil erosion in temperate forests after disturbances, Biogeosciences, 19, 3225–3245, https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-19-3225-2022, 2022.

Gall, C., Nebel, M., Scholten, T., Thielen, S. M., and Seitz, S.: Water's path from moss to soil Vol. 2: how soil-moss combinations affect soil water fluxes and soil loss in a temperate forest, Biologia, 80, 1101-1113, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11756-024-01666-w, 2024.

Gall, C., Oldenburg, S., Nebel, M., Scholten, T., and Seitz, S.: Effects of moss restoration on surface runoff and initial soil erosion in a temperate vineyard, Soil, 11(1), 199–212, https://doi.org/10.5194/soil-11-199-2025, 2025

Glime, J. M.: Volume 1: Physiological Ecology, edited by: Glime, J. M., Michigan Technological University, Michigan, https://digitalcommons.mtu.edu/oabooks/4, (last access: 10 January 2026), 2021.

Gypser, S., Veste, M., Fischer, T., and Lange, P.: Infiltration and water retention of biological soil crusts on reclaimed soils of former open-cast lignite mining sites in Brandenburg, north-east Germany, J. Hydrol. Hydromech., 64(1), 1-11, https://doi.org/10.1515/johh-2016-0001, 2016.

Hu, X., Gao, Z., Li, X.-Y., Wang, R.-Z., and Wang, Y.-M.: Structural characteristics of the moss (bryophyte) layer and its underlying soil structure and water retention characteristics, Plant Soil, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-023-06079-3, 2023.

Huang, J., Wen, J., Luo, D., and Zhu, C.: Response characteristics of soil moisture to rainfall for a single grass type in an urban area, Hydrol. Res., 54, 99-115, https://doi.org/10.2166/nh.2023.095, 2023.

IPCC: Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, A. Pirani, S.L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, Y. Chen, L. Goldfarb, M.I. Gomis, M. Huang, K. Leitzell, E. Lonnoy, J.B.R. Matthews, T.K. Maycock, T. Waterfield, O. Yelekçi, R. Yu, and B. Zhou (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, In press, https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896, 2021.

IUSS Working Group WRB (Ed.): World Reference Base for Soil Resources, International soil classification system for naming soils and creating legends for soil maps, International Union of Soil Sciences, Vienna, Austria, https://wrb.isric.org/files/WRB_fourth_edition_2022-12-18_errata_correction_2024-09-24.pdf, (last access: 19 November 2024), 2022.

Jäger, J. E. and Werner, K.: Rothmaler– Exkursionsflora von Deutschland, Band 4: Kritischer Band, Spektrum Akademischer Verlag, München, ISBN 978-3-8274-1496-0, 2005.

Ju, M., Hill, R. L., Bu, C., Wang, Q., Li, X., and Bai, H.: Disturbance reduces the moss-dominated biocrust inhibition on infiltration and improves soil moisture storage within the Loess Plateau, China, Restor. Ecol., 32, e14067, https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.14067, 2024.

Karthik, R., Wickham, H., Richards, C., and Bagget, A.: wesanderson: A Wes Anderson palette generator (R package version 0.3.7), CRAN [code], https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/wesanderson/index.html, (last access: 8 August 2024), 2018.

Kim, S.: Characterization of soil moisture responses on a hillslope to sequential rainfall events during late autumn and spring, Water Resour. Res., 45(9), https://doi.org/10.1029/2008WR007239, 2009.

Kirchhoff, M., Rodrigo-Comino, J., Seeger, M., and Ries, J. B.: Soil erosion in sloping vineyards under conventional and organic land use managements (Saar-Mosel Valley, Germany), Cuad. Investig. Geogr., 43, 119–140, https://doi.org/10.18172/cig.3161, 2017.

Kögler, L., Ruby, A., Iserloh, T., Seeger, M., and Ries, J. B.: Laboratory flume experiments for detection and quantification of subsurface particle transport in steep-slope vineyards, J. Hydrol. Hydromech., 73, 1-10, https://doi.org/10.2478/johh-2024-0031, 2025.

Lanari, V., Pallotti, L., Lattanzi, T., and Silvestroni, O.: Grapevine root distribution and density in deep soil layers under different soil management practices, Plants, 14(12), 1823, https://doi.org/10.3390/plants14121823, 2025.

Landesamt für Geoinformation und Landentwicklung Baden-Württemberg (LGL). Digital Orthophotos (Open Geodata Baden-Württemberg), licence: dl-de/by-2-0, available at: https://opengeodata.lgl-bw.de, (last access: 27.07.2026), 2026.

Lehnart, R., Michel, H., Löhnertz, O., and Linsenmeier, A.: Root dynamics and pattern of 'Riesling' on 5C rootstock using minirhizotrons, Vitis, 47(4), 197–200, https://doi.org/10.5073/vitis.2008.47.197-200), 2008.

Leonard, J. and Andrieux, P.: Infiltration characteristics of soils in Mediterranean vineyards in Southern France, Catena, 32, 209–223, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0341-8162(98)00049-6, 1998.

Li, B., Gao, J., Wang, X., Ma, L., Cui, Q., and Vest, M.: Effects of biological soil crusts on water infiltration and evaporation in Yanchi, Ningxia, Maowusu Desert, China, Int. J. Sediment Res., 31(4), 311–323, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsrc.2016.05.005, 2016.

Li, X., Bai, W., Yang, Q., Yin, B., Zhang, Z., Zhao, B., Kuang, T., Zhang, Y., and Zhang, D.: The extremotolerant desert moss Syntrichia caninervis is a promising pioneer plant for colonizing extraterrestrial environments, Innovation, 5, 100657, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xinn.2024.100657, 2024.

Li, X., Mu, Z., Bu, C., Wu, S., Yang, C., Peng, X., and Song, F.: Successful Field Establishment and Short-Term Ecological Benefits of a Prefabricated Moss Biocrust Carpet in a Desertified Sandy Land, Land Degrad. Dev., 37, 8854-8867, https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.70703, 2026.

Liu, Y., Guo, L., Huang, Z., López-Vicente, M., and Wu, G. L.: Root morphological characteristics and soil water infiltration capacity in semi-arid artificial grassland soils, Agric. Water Manage., 235, 106153, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2020.106153, 2020.

Liu, Z., Chen, R., Qi, J., Dang, Z., Han, C., and Yang, Y.: Control of mosses on water flux in an alpine shrub site on the Qilian Mountains, Northwest China, Plants, 11, 3111, https://doi.org/10.3390/plants11223111, 2022.

Lulu, C. and Dongdong, L.: Combined effects of moss colonization and rock fragment cover on evaporation and water storage of shallow carbonate-derived laterite in karst mountainous lands, Catena, 258, 109299, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2025.109299, 2025.

Mirás-Avalos, J. M. and Araujo, E. S.: Optimization of vineyard water management: Challenges, strategies, and perspectives, Water, 13(6), 746, https://doi.org/10.3390/w13060746, 2021.

Monteiro, A. and Lopes, C. M.: Influence of cover crop on water use and performance of vineyard in Mediterranean Portugal, Agric. Ecosyst. Environ., 121, 336–342, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2006.12.013, 2007.

Morvan, X., Naisse, C., Malam Issa, O., Desprats, J. F., Combaud, A., and Cerdan, O.: Effect of ground-cover type on surface runoff and subsequent soil erosion in Champagne vineyards in France, Soil Use Manage., 30, 372–381, https://doi.org/10.1111/sum.12129, 2014.

Nebel, M., Philippi, G., Ahrens, M., Holz, I., Sauer, M., and Schoepe, G.: Die Moose Baden-Württembergs, Band 1: Bryophytina I, Andreaeales bis Funariales, Eugen Ulmer Verlag, Stuttgart, ISBN 9783800135271, 2000.

O'Brien, F., Nesbitt, A., Sykes, R., and Kemp, B.: Regenerative viticulture and climate change resilience, OENO One, 59(1), https://doi.org/10.20870/oeno-one.2025.59.1.8089, 2025.

Oishi, Y.: Evaluation of the water-storage capacity of bryophytes along an altitudinal gradient from temperate forests to the Alpine zone, Forests, 9, 433, https://doi.org/10.3390/f9070433, 2018.

Price, A. G., Dunham, K., Carleton, T., and Band, L.: Variability of water fluxes through the black spruce (Picea mariana) canopy and feather moss (Pleurozium schreberi) carpet in the boreal forest of Northern Manitoba, J. Hydrol., 196, 310-323, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694(96)03233-7, 1997.

Proctor, M. C. F., Nagy, Z., Csintalan, Z., and Takács, Z.: Water-content components in bryophytes: Analysis of pressure-volume relationships, J. Exp. Bot., 49, 1845–1854, https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/49.328.1845, 1998.

Proctor, M. C. F., Oliver, M., Wood, A., Alpert, P., Stark, L., Cleavitt, N., and Mishler, B.: Desiccation-tolerance in bryophytes: A review, Bryologist, 110, 595–621, https://doi.org/10.1639/0007-2745(2007)110[595:DIBAR]2.0.CO;2, 2007.

Prosdocimi, M., Cerdà, A., and Tarolli, P.: Soil water erosion on Mediterranean vineyards: A review, Catena, 141, 1–21, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2016.02.010, 2016.

Qu, M., Duan, W., and Chen, L.: The role of cryptogams in soil property regulation and vascular plant regeneration: a review, Appl. Sci., 14(1), 2, https://doi.org/10.3390/app14010002, 2023.

R Core Team: R: A language and environment for statistical computing, R Foundation for Statistical Computing [code], https://www.R-project.org/, (last access: 10 January 2026), 2025.

Rice, S. K. and Schneider, N.: Cushion size, surface roughness, and the control of water balance and carbon flux in the cushion moss Leucobryum glaucum (Leucobryaceae), Am. J. Bot., 91(8), 1164–1172, https://doi.org/10.3732/ajb.91.8.1164, 2004.

Rice, S. K., Gagliardi, T. A., and Krasa, R. A.: Canopy structure affects temperature distributions and free convection in moss shoot systems, Am. J. Bot., 105(9), 1499–1511, https://doi.org/10.1002/ajb2.1145, 2018.

Rodrigo Comino, J., Iserloh, T., Lassu, T., Cerdà, A., Keestra, S. D., Prosdocimi, M., Brings, C., Marzen, M., Ramos, M. C., Senciales, J. M., Ruiz Sinoga, J. D., Seeger, M., and Ries, J. B.: Quantitative comparison of initial soil erosion processes and runoff generation in Spanish and German vineyards, Sci. Total Environ., 565, 1165–1174, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.05.163, 2016.

Ruiz-Colmenero, M., Bienes, R., and Marques, M. J.: Soil and water conservation dilemmas associated with the use of green cover in steep vineyards, Soil Till. Res., 117, 211–223, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2011.10.004, 2011.

Singh, N. K., Emanuel, R. E., McGlynn, B. L., and Miniat, C. F.: Soil moisture responses to rainfall: Implications for runoff generation, Water Resour. Res., 57, e2020WR028827. https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR028827, 2021

Siwach, A., Kaushal, S., and Baishya, R.: Effect of mosses on physical and chemical properties of soil in temperate forests of Garhwal Himalayas, J. Trop. Ecol., 37(3), 126–135, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266467421000132, 2021.

Smart, D. R., Schwass, E., Lakso, A., and Morano, L.: Grapevine rooting patterns: a comprehensive analysis and a review, Am. J. Enol. Vitic., 57(1), 89–104, https://doi.org/10.5344/ajev.2006.57.1.89, 2006.

Steenwerth, K. L. and Belina, K. M.: Vineyard weed management practices influence nitrate leaching and nitrous oxide emissions. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ., 138(1-2), 127-131, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2010.03.016, 2010.

Straffelini, E., Wang, W., and Tarolli, P.: European vineyards and their cultural landscapes exposed to record drought and heat, Agric. Syst., 219, 104034, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2024.104034, 2024.

Sun, F., Xiao, B., Li, S., and Kidron, G. J.: Towards moss biocrust effects on surface soil water holding capacity: Soil water retention curve analysis and modelling, Geoderma, 399, 115120, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2021.115120, 2021.

Teschemacher, S., Rieger, W., and Disse, M.: Experimental Investigation of Lateral Subsurface Flow Depending on Land Use and Soil Cultivation, Water, 11, 766, https://doi.org/10.3390/w11040766, 2019.

Thielen, S. M., Gall, C., Ebner, M., Nebel, M., Scholten, T., and Seitz, S.: Water's path from moss to soil: A multimethodological study on water absorption and evaporation of soil-moss combinations, J. Hydrol. Hydromech., 69, 421–435, https://doi.org/10.2478/johh-2021-0021, 2021.

Tu, N., Dai, Q., Yan, Y., Peng, X., Meng, W., and Cen, L.: Effects of moss overlay on soil patch infiltration and runoff in karst rocky desertification slope land, Water, 14, 3429, https://doi.org/10.3390/w14213429, 2022.

Turetsky, M. R., Bond-Lamberty, B., Euskirchen, E., Talbot, J., Frolking, S., McGuire, A. D., and Tuittila, E. S.: The resilience and functional role of moss in boreal and arctic ecosystems, New Phytol., 196(1), 49–67, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2012.04254.x, 2012.

Van Leeuwen, C., Destrac-Irvine, A., Dubernet, M., Duchêne, E., Gowdy, M., Marguerit, E., Pieri, P., Parker, A., de Rességuier, L., and Ollat, N.: An update on the impact of climate change in viticulture and potential adaptations, Agronomy, 9(9), 514, https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy9090514, 2019.

Van Leeuwen, C., Sgubin, G., Bois, B., Ollat, N., Swingedouw, D., Zito, S., and Gambetta, G. A.: Climate change impacts and adaptations of wine production, Nat. Rev. Earth Environ., 5(4), 258–275, https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-024-00521-5, 2024.

Varela, Z., Real, C., Branquinho, C., do Paço, T. A., Cruz de Carvalho, R.: Optimising Artificial Moss Growth for Environmental Studies in the Mediterranean Area, Plants, 10(11), 2523, https://doi.org/10.3390/plants10112523, 2021.

Wickham, H.: Data Analysis, In: ggplot2. Use R!. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-24277-4_9, 2016

Wild, J., Kopecký, M., Macek, M., Šanda, M., Jankovec, J., and Haase, T.: Climate at ecologically relevant scales: A new temperature and soil moisture logger for long-term microclimate measurement. Agric. For. Meteorol., 268, 40-47, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2018.12.018, 2019.

Xiao, B., Zhao, Y., Wang, Q., and Li, C.: Development of artificial moss-dominated biological soil crusts and their effects on runoff and soil water content in a semi-arid environment, J. Arid Environ., 117, 75–83, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2015.02.017, 2015.

Ya, Y., Dongdong, L., and Lin, Y.: Staging effects of biological soil crust-driven coupled soil–water-vegetation mechanisms in vegetation-limited areas, Catena, 260, 109430, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2025.109430, 2025.

Yair, A., Almog, R., and Veste, M.: Differential hydrological response of biological topsoil crusts along a rainfall gradient in a sandy arid area: Northern Negev desert, Israel, Catena, 87(3), 326-333, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2011.06.015, 2011.

Yang, Y., Deng, Y., Cai, C., Wang, F., Fang, Y., and Duan, X.: Biocrusts' impact on hydrological processes and erosion dynamics: A review, Geoderma, 459, 117383, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2025.117383, 2025.

Zeng, Z., Liu, D., Dai, Q., Zeng, J., and Jiang, J.: Effects of moss patches on the sediment loss, flow hydraulics and surface microtopography of soil slopes in karst mountainous areas, Catena, 249, 108672, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2024.108672, 2025.

Zhang, J. Y. and Liu, T. X.: Experimental analysis of soil moisture response to rainfall in a typical grassland hillslope under different vegetation treatments, Environ. Res., 213, 113608, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.113608, 2022.

Zhao, M., Felde, V. J., Liu, P., Xu, X., Xia, L., Wu, L. and Lan, S.: Influence of artificially-induced biocrust development on soil matrix infiltration: insights from a long-term field experiment and random forest modelling, J. Hydrol., 134211, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2025.134211, 2025.

Zi, R., Han, Z., Fang, Q., Yin, X., Fang, F., Qian, X., Li, S., and Zhao, L.: Mosses and cyanobacteria increased soil moisture and alleviated soil dehydration caused by dry-wet alternation in subtropical humid region, Catena, 264, 109792, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2026.109792, 2026.