



Spatial variations of deep soil moisture and the influencing factors in the Loess Plateau, China

**X. N. Fang¹, W. W. Zhao¹, L. X. Wang², Q. Feng³, J. Y. Ding¹, Y. X. Liu¹
and X. Zhang¹**

[1] State Key Laboratory of Earth Surface Processes and Resource Ecology, College of Resource and Technology, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, P. R. China

[2] Department of Earth Sciences, Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis (IUPUI), Indianapolis, Indiana 46202, USA

[3] College of Forestry, Shanxi Agricultural University, Taigu, Shanxi 030801, P. R. China

Correspondence to: W. W. Zhao (Zhaoww@bnu.edu.cn) and L. X. Wang (lxwang@iupui.edu)



1 **Abstract:**

2 Soil moisture in deep soil layers is a relatively stable water resource for
3 vegetation growth in the semi-arid Loess Plateau of China. Characterizing the spatial
4 variations of deep soil moisture and its influencing factors at a moderate watershed
5 scale is important to ensure the sustainability of vegetation restoration efforts. In this
6 study, we focused on analyzing the spatial variation and factors influencing soil
7 moisture content (SMC) in (0-500 cm) soil layers based on a soil moisture survey of
8 the Ansai watershed, Yanan, Shannxi province. Our results can be divided into four
9 main findings. (1) At the watershed scale, the higher spatial variation of deep SMC
10 occurred at 0-20 cm, 120-140 cm and 480-500 cm in the vertical direction. At a
11 comparable depth but in the horizontal direction, the spatial variation of deep SMC
12 under native vegetation was much lower than that in human-managed vegetation and
13 introduced vegetation. (2) The deep SMC in native vegetation and human-managed
14 vegetation was significantly higher than that of introduced vegetation, and different
15 degrees of soil desiccation occurred under all introduced vegetation types. (3) Taking
16 the SMC condition of native vegetation as a reference for local control, soil could be
17 divided into four layers: I) shallow rapid change layer (0-60 cm); II) main rainfall
18 infiltration layer (60-220 cm); III) transition layer (220-400 cm); and IV) stable layer
19 (400-500 cm). Positive and significant correlations existed between SMC at layers II,
20 III and IV, and the correlations of the neighboring layer ranges were clearly stronger
21 than that of nonadjacent depth ranges, although the SMC at shallow rapid change
22 layer I showed a disconnect (i.e., no correlations) with those at the three other soil
23 depth layers. (4) The influencing factors of deep SMC at the watershed scale varied
24 with land management types. The main local controls of SMC variation were soil
25 particle composition and annual average rainfall; human agricultural management
26 measures can alter soil bulk density, which contributes to higher deep SMC. In
27 introduced vegetation, plant growth conditions, planting density, and litter water



1 holding traits showed significant relationships with deep SMC. The results of this
2 study are of practical significance for vegetation restoration strategies and the
3 sustainability of restored ecosystems.



4 **1 Introduction**

5 Soil moisture is an indispensable component of the terrestrial system and plays
6 a critical role in surface hydrological processes, especially runoff generation, soil
7 evaporation and plant transpiration (Baroni et al., 2013; Cheema et al., 2011; Chen et
8 al., 2008a; Chen et al., 2007; Legates et al., 2010; Sun et al., 2015; Wang et al.,
9 2012a; Wang et al., 2015b; Zhang et al., 2014; Zhao et al., 2013). Moisture in deep
10 soil layers is essential and is closely connected to shallow soil moisture and deep
11 groundwater. It also works as a reservoir for soil, which is important for plant growth
12 in dry seasons (Jia and Shao, 2014; Yang et al., 2012b). This is particularly true in
13 semi-arid areas, such as the Loess Plateau of China, where water resources are
14 incredibly scarce. In such regions, deep soil moisture even becomes the main
15 constraining factor of plant productivity and ecosystem sustainability (Wang et al.,
16 2011a; Wang et al., 2010b).

17 The Loess Plateau of China is located in a semi-arid area. The average annual
18 rainfall in this region ranges from 150 to 800 mm, which is far lower than the
19 average annual pan evaporation (1400–2000 mm) (Wang et al., 2010a). Low
20 precipitation and high evaporation results in lower soil moisture content in this
21 region. The shallow soil moisture is not sufficient to meet the needs of introduced
22 vegetation growth. Moreover, loess soil thickness in this area ranges from 30–80 m;
23 at these depths, groundwater is not available for plants (Wang et al., 2013).
24 Therefore, deep soil moisture, which is stored in unsaturated soil, becomes an
25 important water resource for plant growth (Yang et al., 2012b). However, the
26 vegetation introduced by the national Grain for Green project tends to have strong
27 water consumption. Large-scale afforestation has resulted in the excessive
28 consumption of deep soil moisture, and a large range of soil desiccation has been
29 reported (Wang et al., 2008b; Wang et al., 2010a; Wang et al., 2010b; Wang et al.,



1 2011b). Soil desiccation greatly reduces the capability of a “soil reservoir” to supply
2 water to deep soil layers for plant growth in the Loess Plateau (Chen et al., 2008b).
3 Introduced vegetation in desiccated land is easily degraded with low productivity,
4 and “small aged tree” with a height of 3–5 m appeared widely. Therefore the
5 sustainability of the restored ecosystem is being challenged. Moreover, traditional
6 soil moisture studies, which have mainly focused on shallow depth layers (Baroni et
7 al., 2013; Bi et al., 2009; Gómez-Plaza et al., 2001), clearly cannot reveal the
8 sustainability need for vegetation restoration.

9  studies on deep soil moisture have gradually drawn attention from many
10 scientists in recent years. For example, it was recently found that deep soil moisture
11 was excessively consumed by almost all the introduced vegetation, and high planting
12 density was the main reason for the severe deficit of soil moisture (Yang et al.,
13 2012b). It was also found that introduced vegetation diminished the spatial
14 heterogeneity of deep soil moisture at the small catchment scale (Jia and Shao, 2014;
15 Yang et al., 2014b). In recent years, several studies have been conducted on the
16 spatial variation and influencing factors of deep soil moisture in the Loess Plateau
17 (Jia and Shao, 2014; Liu et al., 2010; Sun et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2012b; Wang et
18 al., 2013; Yang et al., 2014a). Deep soil moisture is an indispensable water source for
19 vegetation growth in the semi-arid Loess Plateau; understanding the spatial variation
20 and influencing factors of deep soil moisture is important for “timely, suitable, and
21 moderate” vegetation restoration, and it can also help in developing proper measures
22 that can help control soil desiccation. In fact, **deep soil moisture content (SMC)**  is a
23 result of long-term biophysical processes controlled by multiple factors (Vereecken
24 et al., 2007). Several factors may impact soil moisture variation, such as vegetation
25 traits, soil properties, topographical factors, climate factors, and human landscape
26 management measures (Lu et al., 2007; Lu et al., 2008; Montenegro and Ragab,
27 2012; Qiu et al., 2001; Vivoni et al., 2008; Zhu and Lin, 2011). The dominant factors
28 that affect deep SMC spatial variation depend on the research scale (Entin et al.,
29 2000). For instance, deep SMC variation was found to be mainly dominated by the



1 type of vegetation at the slope scale (0.1-1 km²) (Jia et al., 2013). It was also found
2 that vegetation and topography are key factors contributing to deep SMC variation at
3 the small catchment scale (1-100 km²) (Yang et al., 2012a). Meanwhile, Wang et al.
4 (2012b) reported that deep SMC variation at the regional scale (i.e., the whole Loess
5 Plateau, covering 640,000 km²) is mainly determined by plant types and climatic
6 conditions. Note that vegetation factors play an important role in the spatial variation
7 of deep SMC at all scales (Western et al., 2004). While all spatial scales, from slopes
8 and small catchments to regions are relevant to the understanding of deep SMC
9 variation, some scales are more operational and meaningful than others. For example,
10 slopes and small catchments based studies tend to be too small in spatial extent to
11 incorporate all environmental factors and human-managed measures (soil traits,
12 climate characteristics, and human-managed measures in one slope or small
13 catchment are usually homogeneous) that most relevant to deep SMC variation (Bi et
14 al., 2009; Gómez - Plaza et al., 2000; Zhu et al., 2014a; Zhu et al., 2014b), whereas
15 at the region scale, it is often impossible to assess essential mechanistic details (high
16 variation of rainfall and temperature can cover the influencing effects of other
17 factors) of deep SMC variation necessary for guiding local policies (Wang et
18 al., 2010a; Wang et al., 2010b; Wang et al., 2012). A moderate scale, covering an area
19 of approximately 100-1000 km² over a watershed or a geopolitically-defined area
20 represents a pivotal scale domain for the research of deep SMC variation mechanism.
21 In particular, it is the scale at which people and nature mesh and interact most
22 acutely (Fang et al., 2015; Zhao and Fang, 2014), and thus is a more operational
23 scale for sustainable vegetation restoration policy making. Up to date, however, little
24 particular research of deep SMC variation has centered on such a moderate scale,
25 and the variation mechanism of deep SMC at this kind of scale is still unclear.

26 In this study, we aimed to reveal the spatial variation of deep SMC and its
27 influencing factors at a moderate watershed scale. ~~According to previous studies,~~
28 ~~factors that control deep SMC variations are different under three land management~~
29 ~~types: native vegetation with a shallow root system, introduced vegetation with a~~



~~1 deep root system, and vegetation with agricultural management measures (Jia et al.,~~
~~2 2013; Jia and Shao, 2014; Yang et al., 2012b; Yang et al., 2014a).~~ This study
3 included all three land management types, covering eight specific vegetation types.
4 We first explored the overall variation of SMC in this area and then compared the
5 deep SMC of these three different land management types as well as identify
6 variations in their profiles. Furthermore, the influence of various environmental
7 factors on deep SMC under different vegetation types is discussed. The objectives of
8 this study were to: (1) quantify the spatial variation characteristics of deep SMC; (2)
9 explore the mechanisms for controlling deep SMC variability among different land
10 management types at the watershed scale; (3) develop recommendations for land use
11 management and the sustainability of vegetation recovery for the Loess Plateau.

12 **2 Materials and Methods**


13 **2.1 Study area**

14 The Yanhe watershed lies in the middle of the Loess Plateau in the northern
15 Shaanxi Province. The Ansai watershed (108°47'-109°25'E, 36°52'-37°19'N) (Fig. 1)
16 in this study is located in the upstream section of the Yanhe river, covering an area of
17 approximately 1334 km², with a highly fragmented terrain; the elevation here ranges
18 from 1057 m to 1743 m above sea level. This typical semi-arid loess hilly region has
19 a mean annual temperature of 8.8 °C and an average annual precipitation of 505 mm.
20 Most rainfall occurs in the form of thunderstorms during the summer months from
21 July to September. Soil types in this study area include mainly loess soil with low
22 fertility and vulnerability to soil erosion (Zhao et al., 2012).

23 ~~The Ansai watershed is located on a warm forest steppe;~~ the predominant land
24 use types in the watershed are rain-fed farmland, orchard land, sparse native
25 grassland, pasture grassland, shrub land, and forest (Feng et al., 2013). The native
26 vegetation in the study area consists of sparse grasses with shallow roots dominated
27 by species, such as bunge needlegrass, common leymus, and Altai heterpappus.
28 Non-native species, such as alfalfa, black locust, David peach, sea buckthorn, and
29 *Caragana korshinskii*, were predominantly used in the study area under the national



- 1 Grain for Green project. The cultivated crops are predominantly maize, millet and
- 2 broom corn millet. Being in a semi-arid climatic zone, water resources represent the
- 3 major constraint of vegetation growth and agricultural crop production.



4

5 Figure 1. Location of the study area and sampling sites.

6 2.2 Sampling locations and description

7 In this study, three land management types were selected, including: (1) native
8 shallow root vegetation: native grasses (NG); (2) introduced deep root vegetation:
9 pasture grasses (PG), sea buckthorn (SB), *Caragana korshinskii* (CK), David peach
10 (DP), and black locust (BL); (3) human-managed vegetation: farmland (FL) and
11 apple orchard (AO). To fully explore the influencing factors of deep soil moisture,
12 we identified the following four types of factors: topography factors, soil properties,
13 vegetation traits, and climate factors, which further included 23 independent
14 variables: average annual rainfall (AAR), altitude (Al), slope position (SP), slope
15 aspect (SA), slope gradient (SG), clay (Cl), silt (Sl), sand (Sa), organic (Or), porosity
16 (Po), soil bulk density (SBD), vegetation coverage (VC), grass biomass (GB), grass
17 height (GH), planting density (PD), plant height (PH), diameter at breast height



1 (DBH), crown width (CW), basal diameter (BD), litter max water holding (LMWH),
 2 litter biomass (LB), and clear bole height (CBH). The distance between each
 3 vegetation sampling site was at least 2 km. The sampling locations are shown in Fig.
 4 1. The main characteristics and sampling numbers for each vegetation type are
 5 shown in Table 1.

6 Table 1. Main characteristics and sampling numbers for different vegetation types.

Vegetation conditions	Native vegetation	Managed vegetation		Introduced vegetation				
	NG ^a	FL	AO	PG	CK	SB	DP	BL
Sampling number	25	22	10	11	18	15	12	38
Altitude (m)	1392.60	1380.14	1370.10	1401.00	1350.61	1435.67	1377.58	1326.54
Slope aspect (°)	170.67	200.60	173.5	195.43	161.75	195.77	128.09	156.36
Slope gradient (°)	16.72	6.27	19.9	13.10	17.56	16.40	24.17	27.24
Sand (%)	44.87	39.44	38.22	55.33	46.42	46.19	52.66	39.96
Silt (%)	47.08	52.63	53.60	38.19	46.57	46.87	47.34	51.75
Clay (%)	8.06	7.93	8.18	6.49	7.01	6.95	7.40	8.30
Organic (g/kg)	7.04	5.31	5.75	6.30	13.30	8.91	5.99	8.10
Soil bulk density (g/cm ³)	1.26	1.29	1.25	1.28	1.26	1.23	1.26	1.23
Porosity	0.48	0.46	0.48	0.47	0.49	0.48	0.49	0.49
Mean canopy coverage (%)	57.36	53.27	39.70	67.82	45.61	66.07	33.75	59.58
Mean canopy height (m)	0.59	1.83	3.58	0.68	1.73	1.85	3.02	11.77
Mean tree DBH (cm)	-	-	6.32	-	-	-	4.98	10.37
Mean crown (cm)	-	-	398.39	-	199.65	184.85	293.40	455.25
Basal diameter (cm)	-	-	10.17	-	1.31	3.76	8.13	12.85
Planting density (/m ²)	-	-	30.5	-	129.67	262.40	36.17	58.66


7 ^a NG, FL, AO, PG, CK, SB, DP and BL refer to native grasses, farmland, apple
 8 orchard, pasture grasses, *Caragana korshinskii*, sea buckthorn, David peach and
 9 black locust, respectively.

10 2.3 Data collection and analysis

11 Each quadrat in the study area was covered by a single type of vegetation. Soil



1 moisture measurements in the growing season were made for the 5 m profile in 20
2 cm increments from July to August in 2014. Soil samples were sealed and taken to
3 the laboratory, and the gravimetric soil moisture content was determined using oven
4 drying at 105 °C to constant weight. Three sampling profiles were randomly chosen
5 to obtain the average soil moisture content for each sampling site. Meteorological
6 data (Fig. 2) were obtained during the sampling period by the MILOS520 weather
7 station located at the Ansai Research Station of Soil and Water Conservation
8 (109°19'23"E, 36°51'26"N). The average annual rainfall (2006-2013) was provided
9 by 29 rain gauges in or around the Ansai watershed, and the Ordinary Kriging
10 method was performed by ArcGIS10.0 to obtain the average annual rainfall at each
11 sampling site.



12
13 Figure 2. The rainfall (mm) and mean air temperature (°C) during the sampling
14 period.

15 Longitude, latitude and altitude were collected for each experimental site using
16 Garmin GPS (version eTrex 30). Slope gradients and slope aspects were determined
17 using the compass method in field investigation; slope gradients were transformed
18 into tan (slope), and slope aspects (clockwise from north) were transformed into cos
19 (aspect). At each sampling site, six undisturbed soil cores were collected from the
20 soil surface in metal cylinders (diameter 5 cm, length 5 cm) for measurements of
21 bulk density and porosity (Wang et al., 2008a). Bulk density and porosity were
22 determined from the volume–mass relationship for each core sample. Soil samples



1 were also collected at each sampling site. Soil particle size distributions were
2 measured using a laser scattering particle size distribution analyzer (BT-9300H,
3 Dandong, China). The proportions of clay (<0.002 mm), silt (0.002-0.02 mm), and
4 sand (>0.02 mm) content were then calculated. Soil organic matter content was
5 determined using the dichromate oxidation method (Hu et al., 2010). At each
6 sampling site, a vegetation investigation was also conducted. In forest sites, the stand
7 density (plants/ha), tree height (m), diameter at breast height (DHB, cm), basal
8 diameter (cm), under branch height (m), canopy width in a 20 m×20 m quadrat, and
9 total canopy or coverage of each quadrat were recorded. In shrub sites, the stand
10 density (plants/ha), plant height (m), basal diameter (cm), and canopy width in a 10
11 m×10 m quadrat were measured. Species composition, total herbaceous coverage,
12 grass height (m), litters and grass biomass were measured in each herbaceous
13 quadrat. The canopy cover was measured by visual estimation, and litter maximum
14 water holdup was measured using the immersion method.

15 2.4 Statistical methods

16 In this study, the depth-averaged soil moisture content (SMC_d) of each sampling
17 point was calculated using Eq. (1):

$$SMC_d = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k SMC_i, \quad (1)$$

18 where k is the number of measurement layers at site j , and SMC_i is the mean soil
19 moisture content in layer i calculated by using three random sampling profiles.

20 The depth-averaged soil moisture content for each vegetation type (SMC_s) was
21 calculated using Eq. (2):

$$SMC_s = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m SMC_{i,j} \quad (2)$$

22 where m is the number of sampling points for each vegetation type (Table 1), and
23 $SMC_{i,j}$ is the depth-averaged soil moisture content in layer i at site j .

24 Soil moisture from each layer was pooled together for the 151 sampling



1 locations to conduct a descriptive analysis. Basic population statistics, such as
2 minimum values (Min), maximum values (Max), mean values (Mean), standard
3 deviations (SD), and coefficients of variation (CV), were reported for both the
4 overall soil moisture datasets and those by vegetation type. SD and CV were
5 employed to reflect the degree of spatial variability of soil moisture in different
6 layers and different vegetation types (Ruan and Li, 2002). One-way ANOVA was
7 used to assess the contribution of different vegetation cover types to the overall
8 variation in soil moisture variables. Multiple comparisons were made using the least
9 significant difference (LSD) method. To determine the contributing factors to soil
10 moisture dynamics, spearman correlation analysis was first used to examine the
11 relationships between soil moisture and environmental variables. Then, principle
12 component analysis was performed to reduce the linear correlation that may exist
13 among selected environment variables and to further identify a minimum data set
14 (MDS) of environmental variables for each vegetation type. All statistical analyses
15 were performed using SPSS (Version 20.0).

16 **3 Results**

17 **3.1 Summary statistics of soil moisture**

18 The summary statistics of soil moisture at various depths are given in Table 2.
19 Kurtosis, skewness, and the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test value indicated that soil
20 moisture data sets were normally distributed. Thus, statistical analysis could be
21 performed without data transformation (Shi et al., 2014). In general, the mean soil
22 moisture, SD, and CV were highly dependent on depth. The profile distributions of
23 mean soil moisture content, SD, and CV are given in Table 2 and Fig. 3. The highest
24 mean value (10.65%) was observed at the 20-40 cm depth, the lowest (8.15%) was at
25 the 120-140 cm depth, and the mean soil moisture below 300 cm was almost
26 constant. However, both SD and CV showed waving trends with increasing depth
27 (Fig. 3). The profile distributions of SD and CV were consistent. The highest values
28 of both occurred at 0-20 cm, 100-120 cm, and 480-500 cm (Table 2), which
29 indicated that soil moisture at these depth ranges had relatively higher spatial




1 variability. Meanwhile, the lowest values occurred at 40-60 cm and 260-300 cm,
 2 which indicated lower spatial variability of SMC at these depth ranges.

3 Table 2. Summary statistics of soil moisture at various depths in the Ansai
 4 watershed.

Depth (cm)	n ^a	Mean (%)	SD ^b (%)	Minimum (%)	Maximum (%)	CV ^c	K ^d	S	K-S
0-20	151	9.78	3.87	2.76	20.73	0.40	-0.32	0.35	N(0.73) ^e
20-40	151	10.65	2.91	3.68	18.98	0.27	0.03	0.06	N(0.70)
40-60	151	10.20	2.91	2.30	17.52	0.29	-0.14	-0.12	N(0.59)
60-80	151	9.35	3.25	2.97	17.53	0.35	-0.50	0.04	N(0.93)
80-100	151	8.84	3.35	2.60	18.29	0.38	-0.45	0.28	N(0.95)
100-120	151	8.21	3.31	3.29	18.23	0.40	-0.27	0.57	N(1.36)
120-140	151	8.15	3.25	3.22	18.95	0.40	0.30	0.75	N(0.93)
140-160	151	8.16	3.09	3.37	18.56	0.38	0.40	0.80	N(0.99)
160-180	151	8.30	2.92	3.14	17.85	0.35	0.70	0.85	N(1.06)
180-200	151	8.47	2.70	3.22	17.89	0.32	1.48	1.01	N(1.13)
200-220	151	8.66	2.58	3.47	19.19	0.30	2.35	1.06	N(1.23)
220-240	151	8.83	2.54	3.59	19.72	0.29	2.99	1.05	N(1.02)
240-260	151	9.00	2.49	3.92	19.47	0.28	2.33	0.88	N(0.94)
260-280	151	9.00	2.37	4.08	18.46	0.26	1.94	0.74	N(1.11)
280-300	151	9.14	2.41	3.56	18.72	0.26	1.35	0.53	N(0.65)
300-320	151	9.15	2.46	3.26	18.08	0.27	1.45	0.54	N(0.73)
320-340	151	9.24	2.66	3.09	19.56	0.29	1.92	0.67	N(0.81)
340-360	151	9.36	2.83	2.98	19.38	0.30	1.31	0.59	N(0.91)
360-380	151	9.32	2.99	3.13	19.88	0.32	1.49	0.61	N(0.91)
380-400	151	9.35	3.09	2.81	20.85	0.33	1.99	0.60	N(1.00)
400-420	151	9.41	3.19	2.68	21.92	0.34	2.09	0.60	N(0.80)
420-440	151	9.33	3.21	2.70	20.97	0.34	1.43	0.55	N(0.57)
440-460	151	9.33	3.24	2.65	19.63	0.35	0.20	0.23	N(0.73)
460-480	151	9.35	3.43	2.67	19.88	0.37	-0.08	0.26	N(0.84)
480-500	151	9.45	3.58	2.43	19.98	0.38	-0.22	0.23	N(0.87)

5 Notes: ^a n refers to number of sampling points. ^b SD refers to standard deviation. ^c
 6 CV refers to coefficient of variation. ^d K, S, K-S refer to Kurtosis, Skewness, and the
 7 Kolmogorov-Smirnov test value, respectively. ^e N refers to normal distribution
 8 (significance level is in parentheses).

9




1

2 Figure 3. The profile distribution of soil moisture content and coefficient of variation.

3

Note: Error bar indicates standard deviation.

4 Moreover, different land management types greatly determined deep soil
 5 moisture variation; the soil moisture statistics of various vegetation types under
 6 different land management types are reported in Fig. 4. The results showed that the
 7 depth-averaged SMC of native vegetation and human-managed vegetation were
 8 significantly higher than that of introduced vegetation. In general, the mean soil
 9 moisture of different vegetation covers was in the order:
 10 FL>NG>AO>DP>SB>PG>BL>CK. The highest mean soil moisture existed in
 11 farmland and the lowest in *Caragana korshinskii*. This result indicated that human
 12 agricultural management measures can significantly improve soil moisture
 13 conditions and that *Caragana korshinskii* was the most serious water consuming
 14 species among the selected introduced vegetation types.




1

2 Figure 4. Soil moisture statistics for different vegetation types. Means with the same
 3 letter above the box are not significantly different at the 0.05 significance level (LSD
 4 test); NG, FL, AO, PG, CK, SB, DP and BL refer to native grasses, farmland, apple
 5 orchard, pasture grasses, *Caragana korshinskii*, sea buckthorn, David peach and
 6 black locust, respectively.

7 3.2 Profile distribution of soil moisture by vegetation types

8 According to a previous study, soil moisture profile characteristics are usually
 9 complex in vegetation covering zones (Jia et al., 2013). Thus, soil moisture profiles
 10 by vegetation types were chosen for analysis. As expected, the profile distribution
 11 characteristics of deep soil moisture varied by vegetation type (Fig. 5).



12




1 Figure 5. Profile distribution of mean soil moisture contents for different vegetation
2 types. Notes: (a) native grassland (NG-native grass), (b) human-managed vegetation
3 (FL-farmland, AO-apple orchard), (c) introduced vegetation (PG-pasture grass;
4 CK-*Caragana korshinskii*; SB-sea buckthorn; DP-David peach; BL-black locust).
5 Error bar indicates standard deviation, I-IV represent SMC at different soil layer
6 depth ranges (I: 0-60 cm, II: 60-120 cm, III: 120-400 cm, and IV: 400-500 cm), and
7 the dashed lines are the boundaries of different soil layer depth ranges.

8 Deep SMC in native grassland zones is seldom affected by vegetation due to
9 shallow root systems; thus, the deep SMC in native grasslands can be regarded as a
10 reference for local control (Yang et al., 2012b). Based on the inflection point of SMC
11 and the trending change of SD in native grasslands, the 5 m soil moisture profile was
12 divided into 4 layers, from I to V. (I) Shallow rapid change layer (0-60 cm); at this
13 layer, SMC increased as soil depth increased, while SD decreased as soil depth
14 increased. Moreover, this depth range is usually greatly influenced by rainfall events
15 and evaporation and is characterized as “rapid change” (Cantón et al., 2004; Entin et
16 al., 2000; Hérard et al., 2006). (II) Main rainfall infiltration layer (60-220 cm); at
17 this layer, both SMC and SD decreased as soil depth increased, which indicated that
18 this layer may be a main rainfall infiltration layer. Furthermore, as depth increased,
19 the level of rainfall infiltration decreased. (III) Transition layer (220-400 cm); SMC
20 in this layer remained relatively constant as soil depth increased, but its SD increased
21 with soil depth, which indicated that this layer is unstable. We characterize it as a
22 transition layer. (IV) Stable layer (400-500 cm); this is a relatively stable layer whose
23 SD is constant as soil depth increases, despite increasing SMC with soil depth. At
24 this layer, SMC is seldom influenced by rainfall infiltration and evaporation. This
25 vertical stratification method of the soil moisture profile may not be ideal, but it can
26 reflect hydrological significance compared with previous studies (Yang et al., 2012a;
27 Yang et al., 2012b; Yang et al., 2014a).



1 The profile distribution characteristics of farmland were similar to those of
 2 native grasslands, except for layer IV. Perhaps this is because management measures
 3 increased the ranges of the rainfall infiltration layer. Similar profile distribution
 4 characteristics were also found for apple orchards, except for the 300-500 cm layer.
 5 As for vegetation-introduced, the profile distribution characteristics of the shallow
 6 rapid change layer (0-60 cm) were more complex due to differences in evaporation
 7 and rainfall redistribution caused by different vegetation coverage, while the deeper
 8 layer (60-500 cm) could be generally divided into three categories: (1) as soil depth
 9 increased, SMC decreased first and then increased (such as PG); (2) as soil depth
 10 increased, SMC decreased first, then increased and finally became stable (such as SB,
 11 DP, and BL); (3) as soil depth increased, SMC decreased first, then increased and
 12 finally decreased again (such as CK). Different profile characteristics can reflect
 13 different soil water consuming traits under different introduced vegetation.



14

15 Figure 6. The coefficient of variation of soil moisture contents for different
 16 vegetation types. Notes: (a) native grassland (NG-native grass), (b) human-managed
 17 vegetation (FL-farmland, AO-apple orchard), (c) introduced vegetation (PG-pasture
 18 grass; CK-*Caragana korshinskii*; SB-sea buckthorn; DP-David peach; BL-black
 19 locust). I-IV represent SMC at different soil layer depth ranges (I: 0-60 cm, II: 60-120
 20 cm, III: 120-400 cm, and IV: 400-500 cm); the dashed lines are the boundaries of
 21 different soil layer depth ranges.



1 The spatial variation of SMC under different vegetation types displayed
2 different characteristics as well (Fig. 6). The spatial variation of native grassland was
3 clearly less than that in human-managed vegetation and introduced vegetation, and
4 the variation was relatively stable as depth increased, except for the shallow layer
5 (0-60 cm). In human-managed vegetation (farmland and orchard), the variation was
6 relatively higher and had a complex profile distribution due to different management
7 measures. However, the spatial variation in introduced vegetation was, to some
8 extent, consistent with the overall variation characteristics in this area (Fig. 5), which
9 indicates that introduced vegetation plays an important role in the spatial variation of
10 deep soil moisture in this area.


11 **3.3 Relationships between soil moisture content at different depth** 12 **ranges**

13 According to previous studies, shallow SMCs at different depths are usually
14 connected through infiltration and evapotranspiration processes (Shi et al., 2014).
15 However, the SMC relationships between the shallow layer and various deeper
16 layers have seldom been explored. Thus, the linear relationships of SMC at different
17 depths ranges (I-IV) were examined in the study area. The relationships between
18 point measurements at these depth ranges are shown in Fig. 7. Scatter plots suggest
19 that no correlations exist between the shallow layer (0-60 cm), moisture contents and
20 various deeper soil layer ranges (R^2 from 0.045 to 0.134). However, there were
21 positive and significant ($P < 0.01$) correlations between moisture contents at different
22 soil depth ranges (60-220 cm, 220-400 cm and 400-500 cm). The correlations of the
23 neighboring layer ranges were relatively high, with R^2 from 0.68 to 0.78, while
24 much lower correlations of soil moisture values were observed between nonadjacent
25 depth ranges ($R^2 = 0.47$).

26

27

28



1

2 Figure 7. Correlations between point measurements at different depth ranges.

3 **3.4 Comparison of deep soil moisture content under different vegetation**
 4 **types**

5 Generally, soil moisture at comparable soil depths was lower in introduced
 6 vegetation (pasture grassland, shrub land and forestland) compared with native
 7 grassland and human-managed vegetation (farmland and orchard). Farmland
 8 (11.07-11.77%) had the highest SMC, followed by native grasses (10.47-11.19%).
 9 The LSD-test indicated that soil moisture content in native grasses and farmland was
 10 significantly higher than that in introduced vegetation ($P<0.05$, Table 3) at almost
 11 every soil depth. Soil moisture varied from 7.56% to 10.4% in pasture grassland,
 12 7.42-9.75% in sea buckthorn, 6.49-8.07% in *Caragana korshinskii*, 7.46-7.66% in
 13 black locust, and 8.10-8.51% in David peach at layers of 60-500 cm. The LSD-test
 14 indicated that there were significant differences in soil moisture at depths of 400-500
 15 cm between different introduced vegetation types. For example, *Caragana*
 16 *korshinskii* was significantly different from pasture grassland, sea buckthorn, and
 17 David peach, while black locust was significantly different from pasture grassland
 18 and sea buckthorn ($P<0.05$, Table 3).




1 Table 3. Soil moisture of 0-50 cm soil layers for different vegetation types.

Land management types	Vegetation types	0-60 cm				60-220 cm				220-400 cm				400-500 cm			
		Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Native grasses	NG ^a	6.74	16.95	11.15ab	2.81	6.76	13.56	10.47a	1.95	8.35	12.84	10.52ab	1.62	8.17	14.72	11.19ab	2.03
Managed vegetation	FL	9.27	17.10	11.9a	2.19	6.91	19.19	11.07a	3.28	7.78	18.62	11.07a	3.20	7.53	20.01	11.77a	3.58
	AO	5.84	13.09	10.01abc	2.59	7.32	14.68	9.6ab	2.40	7.72	14.06	10.45abc	1.73	7.40	15.33	11.4ab	2.26
Introduced vegetation	PG	6.35	12.80	9.43bcd	2.15	6.81	8.36	7.56c	0.52	7.69	13.14	8.97bcd	1.55	8.49	14.29	10.4abc	1.85
	SB	4.52	14.51	9.44cd	2.77	5.15	10.74	7.42c	1.64	7.11	12.09	8.93cd	1.62	5.12	14.67	9.75bc	2.64
	CK	3.82	13.15	7.9d	2.84	5.05	10.50	7.25c	1.35	4.94	11.62	8.07d	2.11	2.63	12.50	6.49e	2.92
	BL	4.81	15.31	10.21bc	2.69	3.56	11.88	7.46c	2.05	4.16	10.94	7.66d	1.77	4.00	13.29	7.47de	2.47
	DP	7.16	13.00	10.4abc	2.04	3.47	10.80	8.1bc	2.11	3.82	13.95	8.51d	3.17	3.21	13.09	8.49cd	3.24

2 Notes: ^a NG, FL, AO, PG, CK, SB, DP, and BL refer to native grasses, farmland,
 3 apple orchard, pasture grasses, *Caragana korshinskii*, sea buckthorn, David peach
 4 and black locust, respectively. Means with the same letter in the same column are not
 5 significantly different at the 0.05 significance level (LSD).

6 As shown in Fig. 8, the SMC in farmland was higher than that in native
 7 grassland, and soil desiccation occurred in all introduced vegetation. However, soil
 8 desiccation varied among the vegetation types. In general, the soil moisture in layer
 9 II (60-220 cm) was heavily consumed in almost all the introduced vegetation types.
 10 PG and SB consumed less soil moisture in layers III-IV (220-500 cm) compared with
 11 the three other introduced vegetation types, while the soil moisture in layers III-IV
 12 (220-500 cm) of DP and BL consumed more consistently. Double layer soil
 13 desiccation occurred in CK, indicating that the soil moisture in layers II and IV of CK
 14 was heavily consumed, while the soil moisture in layer III was less consumed.
 15 Furthermore, despite the deep root system of the apple orchard, soil desiccation did
 16 not occur across the soil profile from 0-500 cm; even in the 320-450 cm layer, the
 17 soil moisture in the apple orchard was higher than in native grasses.



1

2 Figure 8. The comparison of soil moisture contents between human-managed
3 vegetation, introduced vegetation and native grasslands. Notes: (a) farmland (FL)
4 and native grasslands (NG), (b) apple orchard (AO) and native grasslands (NG), (c)
5 pasture grasslands (PG) and native grasslands (NG), (d) sea buckthorn (SB) and
6 native grasslands (NG), (e) David peach (DP) and native grasslands (NG), (f) black
7 locust (BL) and native grasslands (NG), (g) *Caragana korshinskii* (CK) and native
8 grasslands (NG).

9 3.5 Spearman correlation coefficients between soil moisture and 10 selected environmental variables

11 Spearman correlation coefficients were used to determine the strength of
12 possible relationships between soil moisture and selected variables. The correlation
13 analysis results are presented in Table 4, Table 5, and Table 6. The correlation
14 between soil moisture and environmental variations changed with soil depth and
15 vegetation type. In native grassland, the SMC in the shallow layer (0-60 cm)
16 showed significant correlations with average annual rainfall, while the SMC in the
17 deep layer showed significant correlations with altitude (60-500 cm), slope gradient
18 (220-500 cm), soil particle composition (60-500 cm), and average annual rainfall



1 (220-400 cm).

2 In farmland, the SMC in the shallow layer (0-60 cm) showed significant
 3 correlations with altitude, clay content and bulk density, while the deep layers
 4 (60-220 cm) were only influenced by bulk density. In areas of introduced vegetation,
 5 apart from the significant correlations with topography, soil properties, and average
 6 annual rainfall, the SMC showed different correlations with vegetation growth traits.
 7 For instance, the SMC of BL showed significant negative correlations with plant
 8 height (at 60-220 cm depth) and diameter at breast height (at 400-500 cm depth),
 9 the SMC of DP showed significant negative correlations with crown width (at 0-60
 10 cm depth) and basal diameter (at 0-60 cm depth), and the SMC of SB showed a
 11 significant negative correlation with plant density (at 60-500 cm depth). A
 12 significant correlation was found between aspect and SMC in some introduced
 13 vegetation in PG (at 400-500 cm depth) and BL (at 60-400 cm depth). Moreover,
 14 positive correlations existed between SMC and soil surface conditions; for instance,
 15 SMC of DP showed significant correlations with grass biomass (at 400-500 cm
 16 depth), SMC of AO showed significant correlations with litter biomass (at 400-500
 17 cm depth), and SMC of CK showed significant correlations with litter max water
 18 holding (at 220-500 cm depth). Furthermore, in apple orchards, both soil bulk
 19 density (at 60-400 cm depth) and porosity (at 60-220 cm depth) showed significant
 20 correlations with SMC.

21 Table 4. Spearman correlation coefficients between soil moisture (grassland,
 22 farmland and pasture grassland) and selected environmental variables.

	Native grasslands				Farmland				Pasture grassland			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Altitude	0.27	<u>-0.49</u>	<u>-0.56</u>	<u>-0.53</u>	-0.51	-0.37	-0.30	-0.19	-0.04	-0.19	-0.06	0.08
Slope position	0.37	0.11	-0.11	-0.07	0.14	0.20	0.28	0.41	0.21	-0.14	-0.32	0.02
Cos (Aspect)	0.03	-0.22	-0.35	-0.44	-0.27	0.06	0.03	0.21	0.14	0.07	0.64	0.86
Tan (Slope)	0.04	0.36	<u>0.67</u>	0.59	0.09	-0.21	-0.07	0.21	0.02	-0.37	0.09	0.34
Clay	0.09	<u>0.67</u>	<u>0.56</u>	0.43	0.43	0.33	0.37	0.22	0.33	0.13	0.54	0.46
Silt	0.07	<u>0.56</u>	0.37	0.27	0.13	0.24	0.38	0.38	0.17	0.13	0.66	0.59
Sand	-0.09	<u>-0.62</u>	-0.42	-0.32	-0.17	-0.24	-0.35	-0.35	-0.25	-0.13	-0.58	-0.47
Organic	0.02	-0.18	-0.30	-0.19	0.08	0.08	-0.13	-0.23	-0.36	-0.04	-0.28	-0.64
Soil bulk density	-0.11	-0.06	-0.07	-0.04	0.49	0.45	0.31	0.34	-0.16	0.14	-0.01	-0.16



Porosity	0.10	0.07	0.06	0.05	-0.35	-0.33	-0.26	-0.20	-0.08	-0.53	-0.26	-0.12
Annual average rainfall	-0.43	-0.01	0.46	0.37	0.20	-0.05	-0.11	-0.23	0.01	-0.47	0.15	0.36
Vegetation coverage	0.01	-0.19	-0.08	-0.02	0.39	0.15	0.11	0.26	-0.57	-0.38	0.37	0.11
Grass biomass	-0.38	-0.07	0.20	0.08	0.22	-0.05	-0.06	-0.06	-0.49	-0.01	0.28	-0.10
Grass height	0.35	0.33	0.01	0.00	0.20	0.04	0.06	0.15	-0.06	-0.23	0.46	0.32

- 1 Notes: I, II, III, and IV represent SMC at different soil layer depths; among them, I
 2 means SMC at 0-60 cm, II means SMC at 60-220 cm, III means SMC at 220-400 cm,
 3 and IV means SMC at 400-500 cm. Significant correlations ($P < 0.05$) are shown in
 4 bold, and significant correlations ($P < 0.01$) are shown in bold with underline.
 5 Table 5. Spearman correlation coefficients between soil moisture (shrub land) and
 6 selected environmental variables.

	<i>Caragana korshinskii</i> Kom				Sea buckthorn			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Altitude	0.06	-0.34	<u>-0.70</u>	<u>-0.59</u>	-0.15	<u>-0.68</u>	<u>-0.56</u>	-0.33
Slope position	0.34	0.27	-0.08	-0.11	0.10	-0.15	-0.25	-0.35
Cos (Aspect)	0.11	0.38	0.34	0.32	0.43	0.29	0.34	0.07
Tan (Slope)	-0.11	0.06	-0.10	-0.05	-0.06	-0.44	-0.19	0.00
Clay	0.23	0.09	-0.24	-0.09	<u>0.55</u>	0.24	0.22	-0.02
Silt	-0.04	0.14	0.32	<u>0.53</u>	0.29	<u>0.56</u>	<u>0.51</u>	0.41
Sand	-0.02	-0.14	-0.23	-0.45	-0.31	<u>-0.56</u>	-0.48	-0.37
Organic	-0.29	0.07	<u>0.47</u>	<u>0.49</u>	0.13	0.24	0.28	-0.20
Soil bulk density	0.22	0.12	-0.23	-0.24	0.01	0.06	-0.28	-0.18
Porosity	-0.04	-0.01	0.13	0.14	0.00	-0.07	0.20	0.02
Annual average rainfall	0.36	<u>0.56</u>	0.23	0.19	-0.28	0.16	0.22	0.18
Litter biomass	-0.23	-0.17	-0.04	0.10	0.44	-0.28	-0.33	-0.39
Litter max water holding	-0.02	0.31	<u>0.59</u>	<u>0.60</u>	-0.21	-0.13	0.09	0.08
Vegetation coverage	-0.07	-0.03	0.06	-0.03	0.15	-0.02	-0.14	-0.16
Grass biomass	0.03	0.20	0.42	0.45	-0.01	0.45	0.26	0.31
Grass height	0.01	0.22	0.35	0.43	-0.29	0.11	0.06	0.18
Plant height	0.03	0.26	0.24	0.23	-0.05	-0.02	0.25	0.09
Crown width	0.02	0.21	0.24	0.30	-0.48	-0.29	0.12	0.07
Basal diameter	<u>-0.49</u>	-0.23	0.31	0.40	-0.49	-0.28	0.06	-0.01
Plant density	-0.18	-0.28	0.08	-0.09	-0.31	<u>-0.69</u>	<u>-0.57</u>	<u>-0.56</u>

- 7 Notes: I, II, III, and IV represent SMC at different soil layer depths; among them, I
 8 means SMC at 0-60 cm, II means SMC at 60-220 cm, III means SMC at 220-400 cm,
 9 and IV means SMC at 400-500 cm. Significant correlations ($P < 0.05$) are shown in



- 1 bold, and significant correlations ($P < 0.01$) are shown in bold with underline.
- 2 Table 6. Spearman correlation coefficients between soil moisture (orchard land and
- 3 forest) and selected environmental variables.

	Apple orchard				Black locust				David peach			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Altitude	0.14	-0.62	-0.25	-0.16	-0.12	-0.07	-0.07	0.20	0.43	-0.14	0.05	0.06
Slope position	-0.36	0.11	0.34	0.14	0.16	-0.20	-0.22	-0.21	-0.56	-0.34	-0.50	-0.55
Cos (Aspect)	0.38	0.02	-0.01	0.35	0.05	0.34	0.34	0.22	0.22	0.07	0.13	0.30
Tan (Slope)	<u>-0.77</u>	-0.28	0.26	0.33	-0.17	-0.07	-0.17	-0.41	-0.31	-0.15	0.19	0.07
Clay	0.50	<u>0.87</u>	0.42	-0.25	0.19	0.23	0.13	-0.09	<u>0.76</u>	0.30	0.15	0.06
Silt	0.16	<u>0.81</u>	0.67	0.08	0.25	0.27	0.14	-0.15	0.69	0.44	0.42	0.27
Sand	-0.16	<u>-0.81</u>	-0.67	-0.08	-0.25	-0.24	-0.14	0.13	-0.69	-0.44	-0.42	-0.27
Organic	0.31	0.66	0.38	0.13	-0.29	0.00	0.02	-0.22	0.48	-0.04	-0.12	-0.35
Soil bulk density	-0.27	-0.65	<u>-0.82</u>	-0.32	0.20	-0.27	-0.08	-0.06	-0.48	-0.25	-0.43	-0.41
Porosity	0.41	<u>0.86</u>	0.49	-0.06	-0.19	0.29	0.14	0.00	0.48	0.38	0.52	0.30
Annual average rainfall	0.08	0.29	-0.07	-0.38	-0.04	-0.02	0.26	-0.12	0.24	0.17	-0.11	-0.42
Litter biomass	-0.45	0.23	0.47	0.72	0.23	-0.05	0.13	-0.03	-0.06	0.01	0.08	0.08
Litter max water holding	0.18	0.32	0.08	0.33	-0.22	0.28	0.21	0.20	0.59	0.14	0.13	0.27
Vegetation coverage	-0.53	-0.54	0.10	-0.01	-0.03	-0.12	0.11	-0.03	-0.38	-0.39	-0.47	-0.41
Grass biomass	-0.66	-0.22	0.03	0.39	0.12	0.03	0.07	0.30	0.15	0.46	<u>0.80</u>	0.55
Grass height	0.18	-0.03	-0.17	-0.62	0.28	-0.01	0.02	0.08	-0.02	-0.50	-0.01	-0.01
Plant height	0.41	0.26	-0.09	-0.49	-0.29	-0.35	0.11	0.05	-0.56	-0.34	-0.11	-0.01
Diameter at breast height	0.16	0.62	0.31	0.04	-0.20	-0.29	-0.03	-0.34	-0.57	-0.36	-0.24	-0.15
Crown width	0.03	0.49	0.29	0.15	-0.10	-0.26	0.07	-0.07	-0.59	-0.50	-0.36	-0.29
Basal diameter	0.13	0.54	0.22	0.07	-0.17	-0.23	0.03	-0.25	-0.61	-0.42	-0.20	-0.07
Plant density	-0.35	-0.56	-0.20	-0.15	0.15	0.05	0.03	0.18	0.09	0.07	0.05	-0.08

- 4 Notes: I, II, III, and IV represent SMC at different soil layer depths; among them, I
- 5 means SMC at 0-60 cm, II means SMC at 60-220 cm, III means SMC at 220-400 cm,
- 6 and IV means SMC at 400-500 cm. Significant correlations ($P < 0.05$) are shown in
- 7 bold, and significant correlations ($P < 0.01$) are shown in bold with underline.

8 3.6 Principal component analysis (PCA)

9 Based on spearman correlation analysis, only environmental variables that
 10 showed significant correlations ($P < 0.05$) with SMC were retained for further
 11 analysis. There were 9 environmental variables for grassland and farmland (Group 1),
 12 9 environmental variables for shrub land (Group 2), and 15 environmental variables



1 for forestland and orchard (Group 3). Among these variables, some were linearly
2 correlated. Thus, the dimensionality of these data sets could be reduced. Following
3 Hu et al. (2010) and Xu et al. (2008), principal component analysis was performed to
4 obtain a MDS of environmental variables; the results are listed in Table 7. Note that
5 only principal components (PCs) with eigenvalues $N > 1.0$ and only variables with
6 highly weighted factor loading (i.e., those with absolute values for factor loading
7 within 10% of the highest value) were retained for the MDS (Mandal et al., 2008;
8 Shi et al., 2014). For Group 1, the PCA identified four PC that accounted for 80
9 of the variance, of which the first three PCs accounted for most of this variance
10 (68.32%); for Group 2, four PCs, accounting for 84.39% of the variance, were
11 identified; for Group 3, five PCs, accounting for 74.54% of the variance, were
12 identified. In grassland and farmland, PC#1 included 3 variables that had highly
13 weighted factor loadings, including clay, silt, and sand, which indicates that soil
14 particle composition was the most important factor influencing soil moisture
15 variation. Under PC#2, PC#3, and PC#4, only one variable for each principal
16 component had a high factor loading: slope aspect, annual average rainfall, and soil
17 buck density, respectively. In shrub land, the highly weighted factor loadings of
18 PC#1 were clay, silt, and sand, while altitude and plant density were the highly
19 weighted factor loadings for PC#2. Under PC#3 and PC#4, only one variable from
20 each had a high factor loading: litter max water holding and organic, respectively. In
21 forest and orchard land, diameter at breast height, basal diameter, and sand content
22 accounted for the highly weighted factor loadings of PC#1; porosity was the only
23 variation that accounted for the highly weighted factor loadings of PC#2. As for
24 PC#3, there were four variations that were highly weighted: clay, silt, soil buck
25 density, and litter max water holding. Under PC#4 and PC#5, only one variable from
26 each had a high factor loading: slope aspect and slope gradient, respectively.

27

28

29



1 Table 7. Principle component analysis (PCA) of environmental attributes

Principal component	Group 1: grassland and farmland				Group 2: shrub land				Group 2: orchard, and forest				
	PC ^a #1	PC #2	PC #3	PC #4	PC #1	PC #2	PC #3	PC #4	PC #1	PC #2	PC #3	PC #4	PC #5
Eigenvalue	3.58	1.45	1.13	1.05	2.99	2.32	1.27	1.01	4.51	2.62	1.80	1.17	1.08
% of variance	39.75	16.07	12.50	11.71	33.25	25.74	14.16	11.25	30.09	17.49	11.97	7.78	7.23
Cumulative %	39.75	55.82	68.32	80.04	33.25	58.98	73.14	84.39	30.09	47.57	59.54	67.32	74.54
Factor loading/eigenvector													
Annual average rainfall	0.21	-0.50	0.71	0.06	0.23	-0.52	0.41	-0.56					
Altitude	-0.46	0.23	0.53	0.51	-0.08	0.83	-0.17	-0.05					
Slope aspect	-0.16	0.81	0.24	-0.07					-0.06	-0.05	0.21	0.64	-0.10
Slope gradient	0.64	-0.43	-0.04	-0.23					0.55	0.22	0.07	0.01	-0.70
Clay	0.86	0.25	-0.13	0.15	0.95	0.11	0.01	0.10	0.64	-0.44	-0.50	-0.03	-0.04
Silt	0.93	0.27	0.05	0.09	0.97	0.05	0.12	0.07	0.68	-0.44	-0.45	0.28	0.08
Sand	-0.94	-0.27	-0.02	-0.11	-0.98	-0.06	-0.11	-0.08	-0.77	0.39	0.37	-0.23	-0.17
Organic	-0.48	-0.03	-0.50	0.49	-0.15	-0.42	0.26	0.80	0.54	-0.23	0.28	-0.16	-0.12
Soil bulk density	-0.41	0.31	0.07	-0.67					-0.25	0.61	-0.49	0.29	-0.05
Porosity									0.38	-0.74	0.22	-0.37	-0.13
Litter biomass									0.54	0.43	-0.29	-0.04	0.20
Litter max water holding					-0.28	-0.13	0.81	0.00	-0.24	-0.48	0.46	0.31	0.50
Grass biomass									0.27	0.49	-0.17	-0.37	0.39
Plant height									0.69	0.31	0.34	-0.22	0.24
Diameter at breast height									0.80	0.34	0.31	0.14	0.05
Crown width									0.39	0.20	0.43	0.22	-0.09
Basal diameter					-0.13	0.74	0.53	-0.07	0.75	0.37	0.26	0.18	0.07
Plant density					-0.04	0.77	0.21	0.15					

2 Notes: ^a PC refers to principal component. Significant correlations ($P < 0.05$) are
 3 shown in italics, and significant correlations ($P < 0.01$) are shown in bold. Factor
 4 loadings in bold are considered highly weighted when within 10% of variation of the
 5 absolute values of the highest factor loading in each PC.

6 In total, 6 out of 9 environmental variables for grassland and farmland (group 1),
 7 7 out 9 for shrub (group 2), and 10 out of 15 for forest and apple orchard (group 3)
 8 were selected as MDS variables. Moreover, the MDS variables for each vegetation
 9 type were selected (Table 8). It can be concluded that, at the watershed scale, the
 10 main influencing factors of SMC variation under native grasslands were soil particle
 11 composition (clay, silt, and clay content) and average annual rainfall. In farmland,
 12 the dominant influencing factors were clay content and soil buck density. For
 13 introduced vegetation types, the main influencing factors were more complex; apart
 14 from soil texture and physical characteristics, topographical factors and vegetation




1 traits also strongly affected SMC variation. Moreover, the main influencing depth
2 ranges of different environmental factors varied with vegetation types (Fig. 9). For
3 example, in native grasslands and apple orchard land, soil particle size composition
4 mainly influenced deep SMC at 60-220 cm, while in pasture grassland, the most
5 significant influencing depths were 220-400 cm. This indicates that vegetation
6 coverage or human management measures can alter the depths of environmental
7 factors influencing SMC.

8 Table 8. The minimum data set of environmental variables.

Vegetation types	Influencing variables
Native grasses	Cl ^a , Sl, Sa, AAR
Farmland	Cl, SBD
Apple orchard	SG, Cl, Sl, Sa, SBD, Po
Pasture grasses	SA, Sl
Sea buckthorn	Al, Sl, Sa, Cl, PD
<i>Caragana korshinskii</i>	Al, Sl, Or, LMWH
Black locust	SA, SG, DBH
David peach	Cl, Sa, BD, LMWH

9 Note: ^a Cl, SA, SG, Sl, Sa, Or, Po, SBD, DBH, BD, LMWH refer to clay, slope
10 aspect, slope gradient, silt, sand, organic, porosity, soil bulk density, diameter at
11 breast height, basal diameter, and litter max water holding, respectively.



1

2 Figure 9. The influencing depths of the minimum data set of environmental variables

3 for soil moisture content of different vegetation types. Notes: (a) Native grasslands:

4 CI-clay, SI-silt, Sa-sand, AAR-annual average rainfall. (b) Pasture grasses: Sa-sand,

5 SI-silt. (c) Farmland: CI-clay, SBD-soil bulk density. (d) Apple orchard: SG-slope

6 gradient, CI-clay, SI-silt, Sa-sand, SBD-soil bulk density, Po-porosity. (e) *Caragana*

7 *korshinskii*: AI-altitude, SI-silt, Or-organic, LMWH-litter max water holding. (f) Sea

8 buckthorn: AI-altitude, CI-clay, SI-silt, Sa-sand, PD-plant density. (g) Black locust:

9 SA-slope aspect, SG-slope gradient, DBH-diameter at breast height. (h) David peach:

10 CI-clay, Sa-sand, BD-basal diameter, LMWH-litter max water holding.



1 **4 Discussion**

2 **4.1 Spatial variation characteristics of deep soil moisture at the** 3 **watershed scale**

4 The spatial variation of deep soil moisture at the watershed scale varied with soil
5 depth (Fig. 3 and Fig. 5). The shallow layer (0-60 cm) is more susceptible to soil
6 evaporation or rainfall, and rainfall at this layer can be evapotranspired rapidly; thus,
7 SMC at the surface layer increased as soil depth increased. At a soil depth of 60-220
8 cm, the influence of soil evaporation was relatively weak, rainfall infiltration could
9 be stored in soil without the strong consumption of vegetation, and rainfall
10 infiltration decreased as soil depth increased. Meanwhile, the soil layer at 220-400
11 cm was less influenced by rainfall infiltration; thus, SMC remained constant as soil
12 depth increased. Soil depth below 400 cm was a deep stable SMC storage layer (Fig.
13 5). Moreover, compared with the rapid change of SMC caused by rainfall infiltration
14 and evapotranspiration in the shallow layer, rainfall infiltration and
15 evapotranspiration were usually slow processes in the deeper soil layers. This
16 hysteresis process in deeper soil layers decreased the correlation relationship of SMC
17 between the shallow and deeper layers (Fig. 7). However, the existence of deep
18 rooted vegetation and human agricultural management measures altered the vertical
19 SMC distribution rules, resulting in more complex spatial variation (Fig. 3). The
20 highest variation of SMC at this watershed occurred at 0-20 cm, 100-120 cm, and
21 480-500 cm. Surface SMC (0-20 cm) was more prone to daily soil evaporation and
22 rainfall events; different sampling climates and vegetation cover conditions
23 contributed to the high variation (Cantón et al., 2004; Entin et al., 2000; Hérard et
24 al., 2006). However, the SMC was the lowest in the 120-140 cm layer, with high
25 variation. This result is inconsistent with previous studies, which reported that high
26 spatial variations usually appear in higher SMC and decrease when SMC becomes
27 lower (Ibrahim and Huggins, 2011). This is likely because the most serious soil
28 desiccation occurred in this layer for all introduced vegetation types (Fig. 5 and Fig.
29 8), increasing their difference with native grasses and human management vegetation



1 types, eventually resulting in high variation. While the high variation at 400-500 cm
2 may have been mainly caused by the different water consuming capacities of
3 different vegetation types, this depth range is rarely influenced by rainfall event
4 infiltration and soil evaporation (Chen et al., 2008a; Wang et al., 2009).

5 Soil moisture content spatial variation traits varied with vegetation types as well.
6 In native grassland, only the surface layer displayed high soil moisture spatial
7 variations (Fig. 5.), while the soil moisture variation at the deep soil layer was
8 relatively low and stable. Usually, the roots of native grasses are distributed at 0-50
9 cm (Han et al., 2009). Thus, soil moisture below this depth is seldom influenced by
10 vegetation transpiration, and local control, such as topography factors, soil factors,
11 and climate conditions, may contribute to the spatial variation of SMC. In farmland,
12 the SMC and its spatial variation were higher than that in native grassland, indicating
13 that human agricultural measures can greatly increase SMC and its spatial variation.
14 For introduced vegetation, the SMC was significantly lower than that in native
15 grassland, indicating that soil desiccation occurred for all introduced vegetation.
16 Moreover, different introduced vegetation showed different soil desiccation traits
17 (Fig. 8). This result is different from that of a previous study (Yang et al., 2012b),
18 which reported that no significant differences existed among different introduced
19 vegetation. This was probably caused by the difference in annual precipitation; the
20 mean annual precipitation of Yang's study area was 386 mm, which is far less than in
21 our study area (505 mm). The lower annual precipitation resulted in plants not
22 getting enough water, eventually leading to more homogeneous soil desiccation
23 among the different introduced vegetation. Among the selected introduced
24 vegetation types, *Caragana korshinskii* consumed the most water (Fig. 4.); this
25 partly disagrees with most previous studies (Wang et al., 2010b; Wang et al., 2011b;
26 Wang et al., 2009; Yang et al., 2012b), which reported that forest consumes more soil
27 moisture than shrub land. This discrepancy may have been due to the higher planting
28 density of CK in our study area. Moreover, the main difference in soil desiccation
29 under introduced vegetation occurred at 60-220 cm and 400-500 cm (Table 3, Fig.



1 8.); this contributed to the higher spatial variation of SMC at these two layers (Fig.
2 3).

3 **4.2 Mechanisms of deep soil moisture spatial variability**

4 The spatial variation of deep SMC is the combined result of topography factors,
5 soil factors, vegetation factors, and climate conditions. In this study, vegetation
6 coverage was an important factor influencing deep soil moisture variation. The effect
7 of vegetation on soil moisture is shown in many aspects. First, due to the existence
8 of a root system, soil moisture consumption in vegetation coverage zones is usually
9 higher than that in zones lacking vegetation coverage (Savva et al., 2013), and
10 different root systems determine different soil moisture consumption traits for
11 various vegetation types (Fig. 8). For example, the roots of native grasses are usually
12 distributed from 0-50 cm (Han et al., 2009), those of farmland from 0-40 cm (Feng
13 et al., 2007), and those of Alfalfa and *Caragana korshinskii* can reach 3 m and 6 m,
14 respectively (Wang et al., 2010b; Yang et al., 2014b). Thus, introduced vegetation
15 with a deep root system consumes more and deeper soil moisture than farmland and
16 native grasses (Table 3). Individual vegetation growth conditions and planting
17 density can also influence deep SMC variation. For example, deep soil moisture in
18 BL showed negative correlations with plant height and diameter at breast height,
19 while SB showed negative correlations with plant density (Table 5 and Table 6). This
20 phenomenon indicates that, in the deeper root system, forest individual growth
21 conditions mainly explain SMC consumption, while planting density mainly
22 accounts for SMC consumption in the less deep root system of shrubs. In addition to
23 SMC consumption, the canopy interception system and surface coverage system can
24 also have positive influences on soil moisture (Martínez-Fernández and Ceballos,
25 2003; Starks et al., 2006). Generally, a well-developed surface O-layer can hold
26 more soil moisture; thick litter, humus layer and forest grass can retain more rainfall
27 for infiltration as well as reduce soil evaporation (Vivoni et al., 2008). In this study,
28 litter biomass, water holding capacity, and forest grass all showed different degrees
29 of significant positive correlations with deep soil moisture for different vegetation



1 types (Table 4, Table 5, and Table 6).

2 Climate factors that affect soil moisture are mainly determined by differences in
3 rainfall infiltration and solar radiation (Savva et al., 2013). According to previous
4 studies, deep soil moisture is relatively stable compared with the shallow layer,
5 especially at depths below 200 cm. For example, Chen et al. (2008a) found that
6 rainfall only affects the depth of 0-200 cm during drought years. Based on six years
7 of observation in this region (Wang et al., 2009), it was also found that no significant
8 changes occur in soil moisture below 200 cm. Thus, soil moisture in deeper layers is
9 seldom influenced by rainfall events. However, in this study, SMC in the deep soil
10 layer (60-220 cm in *Caragana korshinskii* and 220-400 cm in native grasslands)
11 showed significant positive correlations with the six-year average annual rainfall,
12 which indicates that deep SMC may be a long-term result of a water budget surplus.

13 Topography is another important factor that greatly affects the redistribution and
14 consumption of soil moisture (Qiu et al., 2001; Zhu et al., 2014b). Slope position,
15 altitude, and slope gradient mainly affect the lateral flow of soil moisture. Lower
16 position or latitude usually has a higher soil moisture content (He et al., 2003; Zhu et
17 al., 2014a), while slope gradient usually shows a negative correlation with SMC,
18 indicating that a steep slope usually has a lower SMC than a gentle slope (Kim et al.,
19 2007). As for the slope aspect, different aspects are usually caused by changes in
20 solar radiation (Yang et al., 2012c), resulting in different rates of soil moisture
21 evaporation. Thus, SMC on a sunny slope is usually lower than on a shady slope
22 (Galicia et al., 1999; Wang et al., 2008a; Zhao et al., 2007). In this study, altitude had
23 negative correlations with deep soil moisture; slope gradient showed significant
24 positive correlations with SMC in grasslands (220 cm-500 cm), while significant
25 negative correlations were found in black locust (400-500 cm). This indicates that
26 the introduced vegetation can alter the topography factors' influence on SMC
27 variation; this was also verified by Yang et al. (2012c), who found that introduced
28 vegetation can lead to homogeneity of the deep SMC. This was true for slope aspect,
29 which only showed positive correlations with SMC in pasture grasses (400-500 cm)



1 and black locust (60-400 cm). Moreover, different soil traits determine different
2 water transmission and conservancy characteristics, which may greatly influence the
3 flow or storage of water in soil (Western et al., 2004). For example, Gómez-Plaza et
4 al. (2001) found that soil porosity has a significant relationship with soil moisture in
5 wet areas. Meanwhile, Vachaud et al. (1985) found that soil texture, especially clay
6 content, is an important influencing factor of soil moisture variation. It was also
7 found that soil layers with higher clay content usually have higher soil moisture
8 (Ojha et al., 2014). In this study, soil particle composition was an important
9 influencing factor of deep SMC variation at the watershed scale. Both clay and silt
10 content showed significant positive correlations with soil moisture, and sand content
11 showed negative correlations with deep SMC for most vegetation types. However,
12 soil bulk density and porosity only showed significant correlations with deep SMC
13 in farmland (0-220 cm) and apple orchard (60-400 cm). This result reflects that
14 human agricultural management measures, or other factors that result in lower soil
15 bulk density and higher porosity conditions, can significantly improve infiltration
16 capacity, thus increasing deep soil moisture content.

17 **4.3 Implications for land use management and vegetation recovery.**

18 A balance between soil water availability and water utilization by plants is key
19 to maintaining ecosystem health, particularly in the arid and semi-arid Loess Plateau.
20 The implementation of the “Grain to Green Program” has effectively controlled soil
21 erosion (Chen et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2015a). However, according to this study,
22 soil desiccation occurred in almost all introduced vegetation, while higher soil
23 moisture content was found in native grassland and farmland (Fig. 8). These
24 phenomena indicate that improper selection of vegetation type is a dominant reason
25 for soil desiccation in this area. Thus, more attention should be paid to the selection
26 of vegetation types based on the interactions between soil moisture and vegetation.
27 Among these selected vegetation types, CK and BL caused the most serious soil
28 desiccation (Fig. 4 and Fig. 5); thus, these two types are especially unsuitable for
29 large scale plants in the study area, while SB, PG, and DP can be properly planted in



1 good soil moisture conditions with suitable planting density and human management
2 measures.

3 Furthermore, proper planting location should also be considered based on deep
4 SMC conditions. Annual average rainfall spatial variations can significantly
5 influence deep SMC conditions (Table 4 and Table 5). Thus, annual average rainfall
6 is another important factor for determining planting location. In lower rainfall zones,
7 vegetation enclosure and natural restoration may be good choices, while in higher
8 rainfall zones, shrubs and forests could be rationally arranged. Even in the same
9 rainfall regions, deep SMC is not evenly distributed: lower altitudes (such as a gully
10 bottom or lower slope) usually had higher deep SMC (Table 4 and Table 5), while
11 the deep SMC of native grasslands at steeper slopes was higher than that at gentle
12 slopes (Table 4). Thus, shrubs or trees with high water consumption capacity can be
13 arranged at these locations. At higher altitudes or upper slopes, where deep SMC is
14 lower, native grass and low moisture consuming shrubs can be arranged.

15 The results of this study also indicate that human agricultural management
16 measures can effectively improve deep SMC conditions. The SMC of farmland was
17 highest among the selected vegetation types (Fig. 4); even though introduced
18 vegetation has deep root systems, no soil desiccation was found in apple orchards
19 (Fig. 8). Most of the farmlands we surveyed were level terraces and back-slope level
20 benches with cultivation practices, while apple orchards were equipped with
21 artificial rainwater gathering measures. All of the agricultural measures can
22 significantly increase rainwater infiltration, eventually resulting in higher SMC in
23 these vegetation zones. Moreover, in this study, forest grasses, litter biomass, and
24 litter max water holding showed significant correlations with SMC (Table 5 and
25 Table 6). Thus, increasing land surface cover (such as crop straw coverage, mix
26 sowing shrub and grass) can be another effective measure for improving deep soil
27 moisture recharge. Likewise, considering that plant density has significant negative
28 correlations with SMC, vegetation control (when artificial forest and shrub are
29 mature, the density should be reduced according to deep soil water conditions) may



1 be an effective measure for helping reduce soil desiccation.

2 **5 Conclusions**

3

4 Based on the analysis of mean, SD, and CV of deep SMC at the watershed scale,
5 the results indicate that the spatial variation of deep SMC varies with soil depth and
6 vegetation types. In the vertical direction, the higher spatial variation of soil moisture
7 occurred at three depth ranges: 0-20 cm, 120-140 cm, and 480-500 cm, while in the
8 horizontal direction, the spatial variation in native grasses was far lower than that of
9 farmland, apple orchard, and introduced vegetation at comparable depths. Based on
10 the SMC and its variation characteristics, the SMC profile of local control natural
11 grassland can be divided into four layers: I. shallow rapid change layer (0-60 cm), II.
12 main rainfall infiltration layer (60-220 cm), III. transition layer (220-400 cm), and IV.
13 stable layer (400-500 cm), which can reflect the influencing depths of rainfall
14 infiltration and evapotranspiration for SMC. Soil desiccation occurred in almost all
15 the vegetation types; among them, CK and BL were the most serious, indicating that
16 they are not suitable for large scale planting in this area. Moreover, the main rainfall
17 infiltration layer II had the most serious desiccation layer. The high SMC in farmland
18 and apple orchard indicates that human management measures can greatly improve
19 deep soil moisture, even for deep-rooted apple orchards, in which no soil desiccation
20 was found. Although vegetation type is a dominant factor, the spatial variation
21 characteristic of deep soil moisture in this area is actually the combined result of
22 climate, vegetation, topography, soil, and human management measures. The SMC
23 in native grassland, which can reflect native soil moisture conditions without human
24 disturbance or soil moisture overconsumption, was found to be significantly related
25 to topography, soil traits and annual average rainfall. For introduced vegetation,
26 plant growth conditions, planting density, and litter water holding traits showed
27 significant relations with deep SMC. In farmland and orchards, human management
28 measures greatly increased the influence of soil traits on deep SMC, which increased



1 rainfall infiltration and improved deep SMC. Based on the results of this study,
2 proper selection of vegetation type, proper selection of planting location, and proper
3 landscape management measures are suggested; considering the high SMC
4 consumption capacity, CK and BL are unsuitable for large scale planting in the study
5 area, while SB, PG, and DP can be properly planted in good soil moisture conditions
6 with suitable planting density and human management measures. Good soil moisture
7 condition areas usually include higher rainfall zones and lower altitude, while human
8 management measures, such as macro-terrain reconstruction, artificial rainwater
9 gathering, increased land surface cover and vegetation density control, are effective
10 methods to control soil desiccation. The results of this study are of practical
11 significance for vegetation restoration strategies and the sustainability of restored
12 ecosystems.

13 **Acknowledgements**

14 This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China
15 (No. 41390462) and the Program for Changjiang Scholars and Innovative Research
16 Team in University (No. IRT_15R06). We are also grateful to the Ansai Research
17 Station of Soil and Water Conservation, Chinese Academy of Sciences for their
18 support and contributions to this fieldwork.

19 **References**

- 20 Baroni, G., Ortuani, B., Facchi, A., and Gandolfi, C.: The role of vegetation and soil
21 properties on the spatio-temporal variability of the surface soil moisture in a
22 maize-cropped field, *J. Hydrol.*, 489, 148-159,
23 doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2013.03.007, 2013.
- 24 Bi, H., Li, X., Liu, X., Guo, M., and Li, J.: A case study of spatial heterogeneity of
25 soil moisture in the Loess Plateau, western China: a geostatistical approach,
26 *Int. J. Sediment Res.*, 24, 63-73, 2009.
- 27 Cantón, Y., Solé Benet, A., and Domingo, F.: Temporal and spatial patterns of soil
28 moisture in semiarid badlands of SE Spain, *J. Hydrol.*, 285, 199-214,
29 doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2003.08.018, 2004.



- 1 Cheema, M. J. M., Bastiaanssen, W. G. M., and Rutten, M. M.: Validation of surface
2 soil moisture from AMSR-E using auxiliary spatial data in the transboundary
3 Indus Basin, *J. Hydrol.*, 405, 137-149, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2011.05.016,
4 2011.
- 5 Chen, H., Shao, M., and Li, Y.: The characteristics of soil water cycle and water
6 balance on steep grassland under natural and simulated rainfall conditions in
7 the Loess Plateau of China, *J. Hydrol.*, 360, 242-251, 2008a.
- 8 Chen, H., Shao, M., and Li, Y.: Soil desiccation in the Loess Plateau of China,
9 *Geoderma*, 143, 91-100, 2008b.
- 10 Chen, L., Wei, W., Fu, B., and Lü, Y.: Soil and water conservation on the Loess
11 Plateau in China: review and perspective, *Prog. Phys. Geog.*, 31, 389-403,
12 2007.
- 13 Chen, L., Wang, J., Wei, W., Fu, B., and Wu, D.: Effects of landscape restoration on
14 soil water storage and water use in the Loess Plateau Region, China, *Forest
15 Ecol. Manag.*, 259, 1291-1298, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2009.10.025, 2010.
- 16 Entin, J. K., Robock, A., Vinnikov, K. Y., Hollinger, S. E., Liu, S., and Namkhai, A.:
17 Temporal and spatial scales of observed soil moisture variations in the
18 extratropics, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 105, 11865-11877, 2000.
- 19 Fang, X., Zhao, W., Fu, B., and Ding, J.: Landscape service capability, landscape
20 service flow and landscape service demand: a new framework for landscape
21 services and its use for landscape sustainability assessment, *Prog. Phys.
22 Geog.*, 39, 817-836, doi:10.1177/0309133315613019, 2015.
- 23 Feng, D., Zongsuo, L., Xuexuan, X., Lun, S., and Xingchang, Z.: Community
24 biomass of abandoned farmland and its effects on soil nutrition in the Loess
25 hilly region of Northern Shaanxi, China, *Acta Ecologica Sinica*, 27,
26 1673-1683, 2007.
- 27 Feng, Q., Zhao, W., Qiu, Y., Zhao, M., and Zhong, L.: Spatial heterogeneity of soil
28 moisture and the scale variability of its influencing factors: a case study in
29 the Loess Plateau of China, *Water*, 5, 1226-1242, doi:10.3390/w5031226,
30 2013.



- 1 Galicia, L., López-Blanco, J., Zarco-Arista, A., Filips, V., and Garcia-Oliva, F.: The
2 relationship between solar radiation interception and soil water content in a
3 tropical deciduous forest in Mexico, *Catena*, 36, 153-164, 1999.
- 4 Gómez-Plaza, A., Martínez-Mena, M., Albaladejo, J., and Castillo, V.: Factors
5 regulating spatial distribution of soil water content in small semiarid
6 catchments, *J. Hydrol.*, 253, 211-226, 2001.
- 7 Gómez - Plaza, A., Alvarez - Rogel, J., Albaladejo, J., and Castillo, V.: Spatial
8 patterns and temporal stability of soil moisture across a range of scales in a
9 semi - arid environment, *Hydrol. Process.*, 14, 1261-1277, 2000.
- 10 Han, F., Zheng, J., and Zhang, X.: Plant root system distribution and its effect on soil
11 nutrient on slope land converted from farmland in the Loess Plateau,
12 *Transactions of the Chinese Society of Agricultural Engineering*, 25, 50-55,
13 2009.
- 14 He, F.-h., Huang, M.-b., and Dang, T.: Distribution characteristic of dried soil layer
15 in Wangdonggou watershed in gully region of the Loess Plateau, *Journal of*
16 *Natural Resources*, 18, 30-36, 2003.
- 17 Hørdard, O., Voltz, M., Andrieux, P., and Moussa, R.: Spatio-temporal distribution of
18 soil surface moisture in a heterogeneously farmed Mediterranean catchment,
19 *J. Hydrol.*, 329, 110-121, 2006.
- 20 Hu, W., Shao, M., Han, F., Reichardt, K., and Tan, J.: Watershed scale temporal
21 stability of soil water content, *Geoderma*, 158, 181-198, 2010.
- 22 Ibrahim, H. M., and Huggins, D. R.: Spatio-temporal patterns of soil water storage
23 under dryland agriculture at the watershed scale, *J. Hydrol.*, 404, 186-197,
24 2011.
- 25 Jia, Y.-H., Shao, M.-A., and Jia, X.-X.: Spatial pattern of soil moisture and its
26 temporal stability within profiles on a loessial slope in northwestern China, *J.*
27 *Hydrol.*, 495, 150-161, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2013.05.001, 2013.
- 28 Jia, Y.-H., and Shao, M.-A.: Dynamics of deep soil moisture in response to
29 vegetational restoration on the Loess Plateau of China, *J. Hydrol.*, 519,
30 523-531, 2014.



- 1 Kim, S., Lee, H., Woo, N. C., and Kim, J.: Soil moisture monitoring on a steep
2 hillside, *Hydrol. Process.*, 21, 2910-2922, 2007.
- 3 Legates, D. R., Mahmood, R., Levina, D. F., DeLiberty, T. L., Quiring, S. M., Houser,
4 C., and Nelson, F. E.: Soil moisture: a central and unifying theme in physical
5 geography, *Prog. Phys. Geog.*, 35, 65-86, doi:10.1177/0309133310386514,
6 2010.
- 7 Liu, W., Zhang, X.-C., Dang, T., Ouyang, Z., Li, Z., Wang, J., Wang, R., and Gao, C.:
8 Soil water dynamics and deep soil recharge in a record wet year in the
9 southern Loess Plateau of China, *Agr. Water Manage.*, 97, 1133-1138, 2010.
- 10 Lu, Y., Fu, B., Chen, L., Liu, G., and Wei, W.: Nutrient transport associated with
11 water erosion: progress and prospect, *Prog. Phys. Geog.*, 31, 607-620, 2007.
- 12 Lu, Y., Chen, L., and Fu, B.: Land-cover effects on red soil rehabilitation in China: a
13 meta-analysis, *Prog. Phys. Geog.*, 32, 491-502, 2008.
- 14 Mandal, U. K., Warrington, D., Bhardwaj, A., Bar-Tal, A., Kautsky, L., Minz, D.,
15 and Levy, G.: Evaluating impact of irrigation water quality on a calcareous
16 clay soil using principal component analysis, *Geoderma*, 144, 189-197, 2008.
- 17 Martínez-Fernández, J., and Ceballos, A.: Temporal stability of soil moisture in a
18 large-field experiment in Spain, *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 67, 1647-1656, 2003.
- 19 Montenegro, S., and Ragab, R.: Impact of possible climate and land use changes in
20 the semi arid regions: a case study from North Eastern Brazil, *J. Hydrol.*,
21 434-435, 55-68, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2012.02.036, 2012.
- 22 Ojha, R., Morbidelli, R., Saltalippi, C., Flammini, A., and Govindaraju, R. S.:
23 Scaling of surface soil moisture over heterogeneous fields subjected to a
24 single rainfall event, *J. Hydrol.*, 516, 21-36, 2014.
- 25 Qiu, Y., Fu, B., Wang, J., and Chen, L.: Soil moisture variation in relation to
26 topography and land use in a hillslope catchment of the Loess Plateau, China,
27 *J. Hydrol.*, 240, 243-263, 2001.
- 28 Ruan, C., and Li, D.: [Community characteristics of *Hippophae rhamnoides* forest
29 and water and nutrient condition of the woodland in Loess hilly region], *Ying
30 yong sheng tai xue bao* = The journal of applied ecology/*Zhongguo sheng tai*



- 1 xue xue hui, *Zhongguo ke xue yuan Shenyang ying yong sheng tai yan jiu*
2 suo zhu ban, 13, 1061-1064, 2002.
- 3 Savva, Y., Szlavecz, K., Carlson, D., Gupchup, J., Szalay, A., and Terzis, A.: Spatial
4 patterns of soil moisture under forest and grass land cover in a suburban area,
5 in Maryland, USA, Geoderma, 192, 202-210,
6 doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2012.08.013, 2013.
- 7 Shi, Y., Wu, P., Zhao, X., Li, H., Wang, J., and Zhang, B.: Statistical analyses and
8 controls of root-zone soil moisture in a large gully of the Loess Plateau,
9 *Environmental Earth Sciences*, 71, 4801-4809, 2014.
- 10 Starks, P. J., Heathman, G. C., Jackson, T. J., and Cosh, M. H.: Temporal stability of
11 soil moisture profile, *J. Hydrol.*, 324, 400-411, 2006.
- 12 Sun, F., Lü Y., Fu, B., Ma, Z., and Yao, X.: Spatial explicit soil moisture analysis:
13 pattern and its stability at small catchment scale in the loess hilly region of
14 China, *Hydrol. Process.*, 28, 4091-4109, doi:10.1002/hyp.9940, 2014.
- 15 Sun, F., Lü Y., Wang, J., Hu, J., and Fu, B.: Soil moisture dynamics of typical
16 ecosystems in response to precipitation: a monitoring-based analysis of
17 hydrological service in the Qilian Mountains, *Catena*, 129, 63–75, 2015.
- 18 Vachaud, G., Passerat de Silans, A., Balabanis, P., and Vauclin, M.: Temporal
19 stability of spatially measured soil water probability density function, *Soil*
20 *Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 49, 822-828, 1985.
- 21 Vereecken, H., Kamai, T., Harter, T., Kasteel, R., Hopmans, J., and Vanderborght, J.:
22 Explaining soil moisture variability as a function of mean soil moisture: a
23 stochastic unsaturated flow perspective, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 34, L22402,
24 doi:10.1029/2007GL031813, 2007.
- 25 Vivoni, E. R., Rinehart, A. J., Méndez-Barroso, L. A., Aragón, C. A., Bisht, G.,
26 Cardenas, M. B., Engle, E., Forman, B. A., Frisbee, M. D., Gutiérrez-Jurado,
27 H. A., Hong, S., Mahmood, T. H., Tai, K., and Wyckoff, R. L.: Vegetation
28 controls on soil moisture distribution in the Valles Caldera, New Mexico,
29 during the North American monsoon, *Ecohydrology*, 1, 225-238,
30 doi:10.1002/eco.11, 2008.



- 1 Wang, L., Wang, Q., Wei, S., Shao, M. a., and Li, Y.: Soil desiccation for Loess soils
2 on natural and regrown areas, *Forest Ecol. Manag.*, 255, 2467-2477, 2008a.
- 3 Wang, L., D'Odorico, P., Evans, J. P., Eldridge, D. J., McCabe, M., Caylor, K. K.,
4 and King, E. G.: Dryland ecohydrology and climate change: critical issues
5 and technical advances, *Hydrology & Earth System Sciences Discussions*, 9,
6 4777-4825, 2012a.
- 7 Wang, S., Fu, B., Piao, S., Lü Y., Ciais, P., Feng, X., and Wang, Y.: Reduced
8 sediment transport in the Yellow River due to anthropogenic changes, *Nat.*
9 *Geosci.*, 9, 38-41, doi:10.1038/ngeo2602, 2015a.
- 10 Wang, X., Muhammad, T., Hao, M., and Li, J.: Sustainable recovery of soil
11 desiccation in semi-humid region on the Loess Plateau, *Agr. Water Manage.*,
12 98, 1262-1270, 2011a.
- 13 Wang, Y., Shao, M., and Zhang, X.: Soil moisture ecological environment of
14 artificial vegetation on steep slope of loess region in North Shaanxi Province,
15 China, *Acta Ecologica Sinica*, 28, 3769-3778, 2008b.
- 16 Wang, Y., Shao, M., and Liu, Z.: Large-scale spatial variability of dried soil layers
17 and related factors across the entire Loess Plateau of China, *Geoderma*, 159,
18 99-108, 2010a.
- 19 Wang, Y., Shao, M., and Shao, H.: A preliminary investigation of the dynamic
20 characteristics of dried soil layers on the Loess Plateau of China, *J. Hydrol.*,
21 381, 9-17, 2010b.
- 22 Wang, Y., Shao, M., Zhu, Y., and Liu, Z.: Impacts of land use and plant
23 characteristics on dried soil layers in different climatic regions on the Loess
24 Plateau of China, *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*, 151, 437-448, 2011b.
- 25 Wang, Y., Shao, M., Liu, Z., and Warrington, D. N.: Regional spatial pattern of deep
26 soil water content and its influencing factors, *Hydrolog. Sci. J.*, 57, 265-281,
27 2012b.
- 28 Wang, Y., Shao, M., and Liu, Z.: Vertical distribution and influencing factors of soil
29 water content within 21-m profile on the Chinese Loess Plateau, *Geoderma*,
30 193, 300-310, 2013.



- 1 Wang, Y., Shao, M., Liu, Z., and Zhang, C.: Characteristics of dried soil layers under
2 apple orchards of different ages and their applications in soil water
3 managements on the Loess Plateau of China, *Pedosphere*, 25, 546–554,
4 2015b.
- 5 Wang, Z., Liu, B., and Zhang, Y.: Soil moisture of different vegetation types on the
6 Loess Plateau, *J. Geogr. Sci.*, 19, 707-718, 2009.
- 7 Western, A. W., Zhou, S.-L., Grayson, R. B., McMahon, T. A., Blöschl, G., and
8 Wilson, D. J.: Spatial correlation of soil moisture in small catchments and its
9 relationship to dominant spatial hydrological processes, *J. Hydrol.*, 286,
10 113-134, 2004.
- 11 Xu, X.-L., Ma, K.-M., Fu, B.-J., Song, C.-J., and Liu, W.: Relationships between
12 vegetation and soil and topography in a dry warm river valley, SW China,
13 *Catena*, 75, 138-145, 2008.
- 14 Yang, L., Wei, W., Chen, L., Jia, F., and Mo, B.: Spatial variations of shallow and
15 deep soil moisture in the semi-arid Loess Plateau, China, *Hydrol. Earth Syst.*
16 *Sc.*, 16, 3199-3217, 2012a.
- 17 Yang, L., Wei, W., Chen, L., and Mo, B.: Response of deep soil moisture to land use
18 and afforestation in the semi-arid Loess Plateau, China, *J. Hydrol.*, 475,
19 111-122, 2012b.
- 20 Yang, L., Wei, W., Chen, L., and Mo, B.: Response of deep soil moisture to land use
21 and afforestation in the semi-arid Loess Plateau, China, *Journal of Hydrology*,
22 475, 111–122, 2012c.
- 23 Yang, L., Chen, L., Wei, W., Yu, Y., and Zhang, H.: Comparison of deep soil
24 moisture in two re-vegetation watersheds in semi-arid regions, *J. Hydrol.*,
25 513, 314-321, 2014a.
- 26 Yang, L., Wei, W., Chen, L., Chen, W., and Wang, J.: Response of temporal variation
27 of soil moisture to vegetation restoration in semi-arid Loess Plateau, China,
28 *Catena*, 115, 123-133, 2014b.
- 29 Zhang, F., Zhang, L. W., Shi, J. J., and Huang, J. F.: Soil moisture monitoring based
30 on land surface temperature-vegetation index space derived from MODIS



- 1 data, *Pedosphere*, 24, 450–460, 2014.
- 2 Zhao, J., Du, J., and Chen, B.: Dried earth layers of artificial forestland in the Loess
3 Plateau of Shaanxi Province, *J. Geogr. Sci.*, 17, 114-126, 2007.
- 4 Zhao, W., Fu, B., and Qiu, Y.: An upscaling method for cover-management factor
5 and Its application in the Loess Plateau of China, *International Journal of*
6 *Environmental Research and Public Health*, 10, 4752-4766,
7 doi:10.3390/ijerph10104752, 2013.
- 8 Zhao, W., and Fang, X.: Landscape sustainability and landscape sustainability
9 science, *Acta Ecologica Sinica*, 34, 2453-2459, 2014.
- 10 Zhao, W. W., Fu, B. J., and Chen, L. D.: A comparison between soil loss evaluation
11 index and the C-factor of RUSLE: a case study in the Loess Plateau of China,
12 *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sc.*, 16, 2739-2748, doi:10.5194/hess-16-2739-2012,
13 2012.
- 14 Zhu, H., Shi, Z., Fang, N., Wu, G., Guo, Z., and Zhang, Y.: Soil moisture response to
15 environmental factors following precipitation events in a small catchment,
16 *Catena*, 120, 73-80, 2014a.
- 17 Zhu, Q., and Lin, H.: Influences of soil, terrain, and crop growth on soil moisture
18 variation from transect to farm scales, *Geoderma*, 163, 45-54,
19 doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2011.03.015, 2011.
- 20 Zhu, Q., Nie, X., Zhou, X., Liao, K., and Li, H.: Soil moisture response to rainfall at
21 different topographic positions along a mixed land-use hillslope, *Catena*, 119,
22 61-70, 2014b.
- 23