



Università degli Studi Mediterranea di Reggio Calabria
Archivio Istituzionale dei prodotti della ricerca

Combining plot measurements and a calibrated RUSLE model to investigate recent changes in soil erosion in upland areas in Southern Italy

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Original

Combining plot measurements and a calibrated RUSLE model to investigate recent changes in soil erosion in upland areas in Southern Italy / Porto, P., Bacchi, M., Preiti, G., Romeo, M., Monti, M.. - In: JOURNAL OF SOILS AND SEDIMENTS. - ISSN 1439-0108. - 22:3(2022), pp. 1010-1022. [10.1007/s11368-021-03119-2]

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12318/123783> since: 2024-12-17T17:39:45Z

Published

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11368-021-03119-2>

The final published version is available online at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11368-021-03119-2>

Terms of use:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website

Publisher copyright

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università Mediterranea di Reggio Calabria (<https://iris.unirc.it/>) When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

Combining plot measurements and a calibrated RUSLE model to investigate recent changes in soil erosion in upland areas in Southern Italy

P. Porto, M. Bacchi, G. Preiti, M. Romeo, M. Monti

Department of AGRARIA, University Mediterranea, Feo di Vito, 89122 Reggio Calabria, Italy

✉ Paolo Porto

paolo.porto@unirc.it

Abstract

Purpose In recent decades, soil erosion has been recognized as a serious environmental problem in many countries of the world and the impacts of climate change have focused attention on potential changes in erosion rates that could further increase such problem. These impacts are documented by a general decrease of annual precipitation and a corresponding increase in the number of heavy rainfall events, intensity and frequency that accelerate the loss of fertile soil material.

Materials and methods Direct observations of soil loss obtained during the period 2006-2016 on five experimental plots in Southern Italy were preliminarily presented and discussed. These measurements, ~~using a calibrated~~were used to calibrate the RUSLE model ~~that~~, coupled with independent long-term measurements of rainfall erosivity, allowed calculation of soil erosion from 1954 to date.

Results and discussion The plot measurements showed annual values of soil erosion generally higher than the long-term estimates provided by the RUSLE (1954-2019) suggesting an increasing trend of soil erosion rates during the last 20-25 years. On the contrary, a decreasing trend of the annual rainfall measurements can be observed for the same period.

Conclusions The overall results demonstrated that models like the RUSLE can be considered a useful tool to individuate changes of erosion rates and to isolate the effect of climate change on soil loss. Also, the opposite trend obtained for the annual rainfall measurements suggests that these should not be used to explore the effects of climate change in Mediterranean areas but measurements of rainfall at shorter time intervals (≤ 30 minutes) are necessary.

Keywords Soil erosion • Experimental plots • RUSLE • Climate change • Southern Italy.

27

28 1 INTRODUCTION

29 In the last decades, the impact of climate change on human activities and world economy has attracted increasing interest
30 from the scientific community. According to IPCC (2018), a general increase of temperature and a change in precipitation
31 trends have been documented by many studies over the world (Dore 2005; Alexander 2016). Specific examples are
32 provided in USA by Karl and Knight (1998) that, analysing secular trends of rainfall, established that a general increase
33 in precipitation, reflected primarily in the heavy and extreme daily precipitation events, can be observed. Similar results,
34 related to the intensity distribution of daily precipitation amounts, were observed by Osborne et al. (2000) in UK, Suppiah
35 and Hennessy (1998) in Australia, and Mason et al. (1999) in South Africa. In central and western Europe, Moberg and
36 Jones (2005) documented a significant increase of precipitation trends over the 20th century for both average precipitation
37 intensity and moderately strong events. Recent studies carried out in southern Italy indicated a general increase in the
38 number of heavy precipitation events, intensity and frequency since about 1950 (Capra et al. 2017).

39 These effects have important consequences for environmental risks such as floods, landslides, and land degradation. The
40 latter includes both rates of soil erosion in upland cultivated areas and sediment delivered downstream. The effects of soil
41 erosion in cultivated areas consist mainly of reducing soil productivity and food security (on-site effects) by loss of
42 organic matter and crop yield depression that increases the risk of land abandonment (Kolouri and Giourga 2007; Romero-
43 Díaz et al. 2017) and the decline of rural community (Bakker et al. 2005). The effects caused by the amount of sediment
44 generated in the upland areas and delivered downstream (off-site effects) are even-morealso dangerous as they can
45 increase pollution of rivers (Boardman and Poesen 2006; Yi et al. 2008; Wen et al. 2017), reduce water resources in the
46 reservoirs (Pimentel et al. 1995; De Araújo et al. 2006), and affect the stability of aquatic ecosystems (Palmer et al. 2009).

47 However, problems of land degradation are also affected by other drivers such as urban sprawl, changes in land use, land
48 abandonment, and other social factors (Shao et al. 2021). For these reasons, in the absence of specific experimental sites
49 able to produce field measurements, it is difficult to establish the precise causes of land degradation. In this context,
50 documenting rates of soil erosion in representative-specific experimental sites that are representative of contexts of similar
51 characteristics can be an important tool to understand better the consequences of climate change on larger-areaslarger
52 areas and on long-term temporal scale.

53 Experimental plots, equipped specifically for monitoring rainfall, runoff and soil loss, proved to be an important means
54 to obtain information on the impacts of soil properties, land use, crop management etc. on erosion rates erosion-rates
55 because external factors are under control (Loughran 1989). However, despite their utility, some difficulties to extrapolate

the results for larger spatial scales or different time windows for which no direct measurements are available must be recognized (see Ewans 1995; Boardman 2006). In recent years, the attempt to compile an extensive database of short to medium-term erosion rates as measured on erosion plots in Europe and Mediterranean regions under natural rainfall was made by several authors (see Cerdan et al. 2010; Maetens et al. 2012). Even if this effort produced the largest (227 plot-measuring sites) database of plot runoff and soil loss data in Europe (Maetens et al. 2012), these measurements are frequently limited to the period of the experiments (normally, a few years) and it is difficult to extend their temporal trend in the absence of retrospective information. In other words, this large dataset is very useful to investigate the effects of land use, soil type and topography but insufficient data about climate precludes any statistical analysis aimed at identifying possible trends in soil erosion rates (see Cerdan et al. 2010). In such situations, the use of calibrated models, in which the climate component is taken into account, can be very useful.

In this respect, numerical models of different generations have been employed to predict soil loss in the absence of direct measurements during the last decades. These models can be based on empirical approaches, such as the Universal Soil Loss Equation (Wischmeier and Smith 1978) and its derived version (Renard et al. 1994), on simple correlation analyses between soil erosion and topography (Bagarello et al. 2011; 2018), or on more complex algorithms of calculation that interpret physical processes related to detachment and transport of soil particles (Nearing et al. 1989). However, even if their use proved to be very effective for a short-time scale, it is important to note that such models should be calibrated and validated to provide reliable results for larger time windows in which possible effects due to climate change can be expected. Results in this direction were obtained by several authors. Chaplot (2007) and Ficklin et al. (2009), for example, explored the performance of the SWAT model to predict long-term soil loss in cultivated areas of the USA. Pandey et al. (2017), in India, tested the hydrological component of the SWAT model in areas affected by climate change. Pruski and Nearing (2002a,b) provided long-term simulations of soil loss using WEPP coupled with historical rainfall datasets available in three different locations of the USA. Pal and Chakraborty (2019) made a long-term application of the RUSLE model to evaluate the impact of climate change on soil erosion in sub-tropical monsoon areas in the West Bengal state of eastern India. Favis-Mortlock and Boardman (1995) used the EPIC model to evaluate changes on erosion rate in the UK. However, it must be recognized that most of these contributions, even if USLE derived, are based on simulation exercises in which the rainfall erosivity is not calculated using the basic approach proposed by Wischmeier and Smith (1978) that requires the knowledge of rainfall energy at event scale, but it is derived from indirect relationships with daily or monthly rainfall, using simplified approaches like Arnoldus index (Pal and Chakraborty 2019) or applying more sophisticated climate generators like CLIGEN (Pruski and Nearing 2002a,b). The importance of direct observations of rainfall erosivity was emphasized by Wischmeier and Smith (1978) that suggested a period of at least 22 years of measurements for

calculating the R-factor (Renard et al. 1997). However, as pointed out by Verstraeten et al. (2006), this period of 22 years is recommended because very few detailed rainfall data records exist for a longer time period in areas outside the USA where the USLE was developed. Verstraeten et al. (2006), provided an example of long-term dataset of rainfall erosivity analysing a record of 10-min rainfall (105 years) in Belgium. These authors established that average 10-year erosion rates calculated with the RUSLE have increased by 24–34% from the first decade (1903–1912) to the last one (1993–2002) of the study period, as a consequence of changing rain erosivity through time and encouraged the use of long-term records of short time-interval rainfall in simulation exercises.

Recent studies carried out at a plot scale in Southern Italy documented high rates of soil erosion both on cultivated lands (Bagarello et al. 2010) and in areas subject to afforestation that support discontinuous forest cover (Khodadadi et al. 2020). In these areas, several attempts to calibrate and validate numerical models like RUSLE (Di Stefano et al. 1999), MUSLE (Cinnirella et al. 1998), USLE-M (Bagarello et al. 2018), and SEDD (Porto and Callegari 2021) have been successful in their ability to reproduce soil erosion rates or sediment yield both at plot and at catchment scale for short time windows. However, the absence of long-term measurements and the general difficulty of obtaining equivalent records of model input parameters like rainfall erosivity or crop factors precluded specific studies aimed at investigating long-term soil erosion rates in Italy. A few exceptions are related to the combined use of radiotracers ^{137}Cs and $^{210}\text{Pb}_{\text{ex}}$ that in view of their ability to obtain retrospective information on soil erosion for different time windows provided important results in this direction (see Porto et al. 2016; 2018).

In this contribution, direct observations of soil erosion obtained in 5 experimental plots during 11 years of investigation were combined with a long-term record of rainfall erosivity to reconstruct a trend of soil loss in a typical upland area of Southern Italy. More specifically, the measurements of soil loss served to calibrate the RUSLE model for cultivated soils supporting typical Mediterranean crops and the rainfall erosivity data were used to derive estimates of erosion rates during the last 6-7 decades. This experiment provided evidence of a change of erosion rates during the last 2-3 decades emphasizing the effect of climate change on soil erosion in cultivated lands in Mediterranean areas.

2 MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study area (38°16' N, 15°49' E) is located in Calabria, Southern Italy at an elevation of 585 m a.s.l. (Fig. 1). The climate is typically Mediterranean, characterized by a rainy season extending from October to March and a dry summer during which occasional thunderstorms may occur. The annual precipitation (P_a), measured at the rainfall station of Santa Cristina d'Aspromonte, is approximately 1470 mm (Arpacal datasets 1939-2019). Mean annual temperatures range from

115 14 °C to 15 °C, based on local reports ([Arpascal datasets 1988-2020](#)). The land use is characterized by cultivated soils
116 where traditional arable and vegetable crops are grown. In 2005, the Department of Agraria of the University
117 ‘Mediterranea’ of Reggio Calabria established five (5m x 25m) experimental plots (Fig. 1) to explore the effect of different
118 cropping systems on runoff and soil loss (Preiti et al. 2017).

119
120 **Fig. 1 – The study area and the experimental plots**

121 The plots were built on a 10% slope and support Typic Hapludands soils characterised by a silty loam texture (20% sand,
122 76% silt, and 4% clay). The plots were established, with minimum soil disturbance, over an area subject to traditional
123 cultivation in order to make the measurements representative for the local area. In this respect, plot 1 has been maintained
124 bare since the beginning of the experiment, by up and down slope tillage operations according to Wischmeier and Smith
125 (1978). Three plots (plot 2, 3, and 4) have supported different crops typical of the area that include rye, lupin, wheat, oat,
126 cauliflower, sorghum, potatoes, tall fescue, horseradish, aubergines, trifolium. These were cultivated using similar
127 management systems but with different inter-annual rotations. Plot 5 was covered mainly by natural vegetation, tall fescue
128 and lupin and was subjected to minimal tillage and crop operations during the last six years of measurements. Also, crop
129 residues were left on soil surface after each tillage operation. This choice was made to explore the effect of conservative
130 techniques on soil loss (for soil and crop management details see Preiti et al. 2017).

131 Runoff and soil loss were measured for each plot, at event scale, for the period 2006-2016. More specifically, the runoff
132 and soil loss were collected by gutters installed along the lower ends of each plot and diverted into a sized tank located at
133 the base of the plot (see Fig. 1). Sampling of water and sediment stored in the tanks was undertaken two-three days after
134 the end of each rainfall event. The sediment deposited on the bottom of the tank was collected and transported to the
135 laboratory of the Department of Agraria where it was oven dried at 60 °C and weighed to determine its mass. The
136 measurements of soil loss used in this experiment are related to 135 events that have occurred during the period from
137 January 2006 to December 2016.

138
139 **3 RESULTS**

140 **3.1 The measured values of soil loss obtained for the study period**

141 The empirical frequency of the total annual soil losses obtained for the period 2006-2016 is illustrated in Fig. 2 for each
142 experimental plot.

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

Fig. 2 – Values of soil loss obtained from each plot for the study period 2006-2016. The graph in (a) shows the frequency distribution of the annual values. The box plot in (b) indicates the data distribution. Total annual (a) and mean (b) soil losses obtained from each plot for the study period 2006-2016. The vertical bars in (b) indicate the standard error for each plot

In Fig. 2, ~~summary data~~ distribution for the mean soil loss from each plot during the study period ~~are is~~ also reported. These results point out both the inter-annual variability of soil loss that reflects changes in erosivity during the study period and the inter-plot variability related to the impact of different cropping practices on soil loss.

It is clear from Fig. 2 that the annual values of soil loss obtained from plot 1, in which vegetation cover was absent for most of the study period, are greater than those from the other plots. This result is expected because it emphasizes the importance of vegetation cover in the other plots that must be seen as a key factor in soil erosion studies. The mean value of soil loss related to plot 1 accounts for ca. 69.0 t ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ (SE = 13.5 t ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹). Even if this value is in line with the results obtained in areas where similar experiments were conducted (see Bagarello et al. 2018), it cannot be considered representative of a long-term pattern of land use in the area because it reflects the bare conditions maintained in this plot for the duration of the experiment (11 years). The mean values of soil loss obtained from the other plots range from 14.4 t ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ (SE = 7.0 t ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹), obtained from plot 5, to 39.2 t ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ (SE = 11.7 t ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹) obtained from plot 3. These values, reported in Table 1, reflect the different crop rotations adopted in the plots and indicate the crop system related to plot 5, which was subjected to minimal tillage and crop operations, as the most conservative in the area.

3.2 The calibration of the RUSLE model using the experimental data

As reported above, the study period extended for 11 years and these measurements, considering the number of events (135) occurred during the experiment, offer an important tool to calibrate soil erosion models in order to obtain soil loss estimates for a longer period. The available datasets and the size of the plots suggested the use of the RUSLE model to make such attempt. This calibration exercise was based on the following version of the USLE as originally proposed by Wischmeier and Smith (1978):

$$A_i = R_i K L S C_i P \quad (1)$$

in which, the soil loss, A_i , is expressed in $t\ ha^{-1}\ yr^{-1}$; the rainfall erosivity factor, R_i , is expressed in $MJ\ mm\ ha^{-1}\ h^{-1}\ yr^{-1}$; the soil erodibility factor, K , is expressed in $t\ ha\ h\ MJ^{-1}\ mm^{-1}$; LS represents the topographic factor (dimensionless); C_i represents the cover and management factor (dimensionless), and P indicates the support practice factor (dimensionless).

In this contribution, the Eq. (1) was calibrated at annual scale and the subscript i represents the i -th year for which soil loss observations are available. It is worth noticing that, because of the absence of support practices, the P -factor was set equal to 1.

The model calibration was carried out in three steps: the first step is related to the calculation of the factors R_i and LS that required rainfall and topographic measurements, respectively; the second step aimed at calculating the soil erodibility factor K ; the third step allowed the calculation of the C_i values for each plot. These factors were determined as follows.

3.2.1 The rainfall erosivity factor and the topographic factor

The rainfall erosivity factor R , as defined by Wischmeier and Smith (1978), represents the mean annual value of the rainfall erosion index, ERI , calculated by summing the values of the rainfall erosion index, EI , values obtained for each erosive event. The calculation of EI ($MJ\ mm\ ha^{-1}\ h^{-1}$) for each individual storm required a continuous record of rainfall intensity and it was determined by the product of total storm energy E ($MJ\ ha^{-1}$) and maximum 30-min intensity i_{30} ($mm\ h^{-1}$):

$$EI = E\ i_{30} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^m e_j \Delta V_j \right) i_{30} \quad (2)$$

with e_j indicating the rainfall energy per unit depth of rainfall per unit area, and ΔV_j the rainfall depth for the j -th interval of the storm hyetograph which is divided into m parts with essentially constant intensity. The equations proposed by Foster et al. (1981) were used to calculate the rainfall energy e_j :

$$e_j = 0.119 + 0.0873 \log_{10}(i_j) \quad \text{if } i_j \leq 76\ mm\ h^{-1} \quad (3a)$$

$$e_j = 0.283 \quad \text{if } i_j > 76\ mm\ h^{-1} \quad (3b)$$

where i_j ($mm\ h^{-1}$) is the rainfall intensity calculated as follows

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic, Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Subscript

$$i_j = \frac{\Delta V_j}{\Delta t_j} \quad (4)$$

in which Δt_j indicates the interval duration over which intensity is assumed to be constant (Porto 2016). The rainfall record used in this contribution was obtained from the local station of Santa Cristina d'Aspromonte (Arpaca datasets), for which data with a temporal resolution $\Delta t = 5$ min were available. The mean value of the rainfall erosivity factor R calculated from this station for the study period 2006-2016 is reported in Table 1.

The topographic factor, LS (dimensionless), was calculated using the equation proposed by McCool et al. (1987), (Renard et al. 1994):

$$LS = (\lambda_i/22.13)^{m_i} \times (16.8 \sin \alpha_i - 0.5) \quad (5)$$

considering that, for the study plots, $\tan \alpha > 0.09$, with α representing the slope angle.

In eq. (5), λ_i indicates the slope length of the plot and the exponent m_i is given by the equation proposed by McCool et al. (1989):

$$m_i = \frac{f_i}{1+f_i} \quad (6)$$

where f_i represents the ratio of rill to interrill erosion and can be expressed by the following formula:

$$f_i = \frac{\sin \alpha_i}{0.0896 \left(3 \sin^{0.8} \alpha_i + 0.56 \right)} \quad (7)$$

The value of LS , that is assumed constant in each plot for the study period, is reported in Table 1.

Table 1 – The values of the RUSLE parameters obtained for each plot for the study period (2006-2016). In the last two columns are also reported the mean values of soil loss (A_i) measured during the study period (2006-2016) and those related to the long-term simulation (1954-2019).

Formatted: Justified

3.2.2 The soil erodibility factor K

The soil erodibility factor K , as defined by Wischmeier and Smith (1978), represents the mean annual value of the relative inherent resistance of a soil to the detachment, entrainment and transport actions operated by rainfall and runoff. The K -factor can be determined according to certain soil characteristics that include texture, presence of organic matter, permeability. In this respect, Wischmeier et al. (1971) provided a nomograph, supported by an explicit equation, to determine the value of K based on the above variables. However, if soil loss measurements are available at a plot scale, a direct evaluation of K is possible. The method is based on a simple regression analysis between soil loss measurements and rainfall erosivity, as proposed by Wischmeier and Mannering (1969), using the USLE unit plot (22.1 m long with a uniform 9% slope, continuously maintained in a clean-tilled fallow condition with upslope and downslope tillage).

Fig. 3 – Calculation of the soil erodibility factor K

In this contribution, we used the annual measurements of soil loss from the bare plot to obtain a representative value of K for the soils under investigation. Considering that our bare plot has a length of 25 m and a slope of 10%, an adjustment was necessary according to eq. (1). In other words, plotting the annual values of soil loss obtained from the bare plot against the corresponding values of the product R_iLS , assuming that the C -factor and the P -factor are equal to 1, it was possible to use the slope of the computed least-squares regression line, passing through the origin, to determine K . The method is illustrated in Fig. 3 in which the line of equation $y = mx$ is superimposed on the experimental pairs. The slope m , that represents the value of K , resulted equal to 0.011 ($\text{t ha h ha}^{-1} \text{ MJ}^{-1} \text{ mm}^{-1}$) and this value was assumed to be representative for our plots.

3.2.3 The cover and management factor C

The availability of soil loss measurements, together with the calculation of R_i and LS , and the direct determination of K from the bare plot, made it possible to derive the values of the cover and management factor C_i for the plots 2, 3, 4, and 5 in which different combinations of cropping systems were adopted during the 11 years of investigation. Again, this calibration exercise was carried out using the annual data of soil loss A_i and the following equation (Cinnirella et al. 1998):

$$C_i = \frac{A_i}{R_i K LS} \quad (8)$$

in which, for each plot, C_i is the value representing the crop factor for the year i .

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

257 The results of eq. (8) are summarized in Fig. 4, where ~~the the frequency distribution of C_i values~~ single values of C_i and
258 ~~their frequency distribution are~~ is reported for each plot.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic, Subscript

259 A visual inspection of Fig. 4 suggests that the values of C_i show evidence of an interannual variability for each single plot
260 and document a significant difference from plot to plot. These findings are expected because the values of C_i depend both
261 on the cropping system adopted in each period and on the value of the rainfall erosivity factor calculated for that
262 corresponding period. For this reason, it is difficult to choose a representative value of C for each plot as it assumes the
263 meaning of a random variable.

264 It can be seen from Fig. 4 that each frequency distribution follows, approximately, a log-normal distribution (see dotted
265 line superimposed in each graph) that suggests the presence of a random component. Based on these findings, we decided
266 to calculate the value of C_m that produced the perfect agreement between measured and calculated soil loss for the study
267 period and we assumed this value as the ~~C-factor~~ value representative for each plot. The four values of C_m resulting from
268 this calculation are also reported in Table 1.

Formatted: Font: Italic, Subscript

269
270 **Fig. 4** – The frequency distribution of ~~the C-factor~~ value for each plot. The dashed line represents a log-normal theoretical
271 distribution

Formatted: Font: Italic, Subscript

272
273 The cropping systems supported by the plots 2, 3, 4, and 5 are typical of the cultivation techniques practiced in the upland
274 areas of Southern Italy since the early 50s. For these reasons, the values of C_m reported in Table 1 can be considered
275 representative of a long-term period in these areas. The same considerations can be extended to the mean value of the K -
276 factor that can be assumed characteristic for this type of soil. Following this logic, in the absence of support practices and
277 assuming a constant value of LS , only the rainfall erosivity factor R_i would affect the temporal variability of soil loss and
278 it can be used to reconstruct the trend of soil erosion rates since the early 50s if a long-term dataset of ~~R_i~~ R is available.

279 The annual values of R_i were obtained using the rainfall data available at the local station of Santa Cristina d’Aspromonte
280 since 1954. These measurements were produced by the Italian Hydrographic Service at different temporal resolutions:
281 the data for the period 1990-2019 are available at a time interval $\Delta t = 5$ min, with some short breakdown (Arpascal
282 Datasets); the data for the period 1954-1989 were provided in a graphical form that required manual digitization to allow
283 calculation of R_i at a temporal resolution of 30 minutes (see Wischmeier and Smith 1978). In order to get the values of
284 precipitation amount and intensity consistent with those derived from the second dataset, the 5-minute data available for
285 the period 1990-2019 were aggregated at a 30-minute temporal scale and the corresponding values of R_i were calculated
286 accordingly (Porto 2016).

Calculation of R_i for the missing years (1954-2005 and 2017-2019) and the availability of a calibrated RUSLE model for the shorter study period (2006-2016) allowed the reconstruction of soil erosion rates for the period 1954-2019. This calculation was made by hypothesizing 4 scenarios, one for each plot, in which only the C -factor_{*i*} was considered different from plot to plot and assumed equal to the C_m values listed in Table 1. The results of these predictions are illustrated in Fig. 5, where the values of soil loss A_i ($t\ ha^{-1}$) are reported in graphical form for each year. It is worth noticing that the predicted values of A_i ($t\ ha^{-1}$) are related to the two periods 1954-2005 and 2017-2019 for which soil erosion measurements are absent. On the contrary, the values of A_i ($t\ ha^{-1}$) for the study period 2006-2016 are those measured by the experimental device and incorporated into the long-term record of Fig. 5. The mean values of soil loss for the period 1954-2019, that include measured and estimated data, are reported in Table 1.

Formatted: Font: Italic, Subscript

Fig. 5 – The annual soil loss reconstructed for each plot for the period 1954-2019. Grey bars indicate the estimated values while white bars report the measured values obtained for the study period

~~In order to confirm this hypothesis~~ The datasets illustrated in Fig. 5 were processed by a standard trend analysis test was performed using the software TREND (2012). More specifically, the Cumulative Deviation Test and the Student's t Test were carried out for each scenario in order to see if the means in two parts of each record are different (for an unknown time of change). The overall results suggested, at a level of probability $P \leq 0.05$, that, for each scenario, the mean for the period 1954-1995 is significantly lower than the mean related to the period 1995-2019 and confirmed the above hypothesis indicated that soil loss has not been stationary over the past 66 years.

4 DISCUSSION

The histograms illustrated in Fig. 5 and the mean values of soil loss reported in Table 1 provide important information on the magnitude of soil erosion since 1954 and offer a basis to understand the longer-term variability of soil loss in this area. The mean values of soil loss (plot measurements) related to the study period 2006-2016 are systematically higher than the corresponding long-term estimates for the period 1954-2019 (see Table 1). Also, a first visual inspection of the four graphs in Fig. 5 together with the linear trend overlaid on each figure suggests that soil loss shows an increasing trend for the period covered by this study. ~~In order to confirm this hypothesis, a standard trend analysis test was performed using the software TREND (2012). More specifically, the Cumulative Deviation Test and the Student's t Test were carried out for each scenario in order to see if the means in two parts of each record are different (for an unknown time of change). The overall results suggested, at a level of probability $P \leq 0.05$, that, for each scenario, the mean for the period 1954-1995 is significantly lower than the mean related to the period 1995-2019 and confirmed the above hypothesis that soil loss has~~

not been stationary over the past 66 years. These results are consistent with the work of Verstraeten et al. (2006) that observed an increase of an average 10-year erosion rate calculated in Belgium with the RUSLE as a consequence of changing rainfall erosivity through time. In fact, these changes reflect the temporal trend of R_i reported in Fig. 6 and are a consequence of a general increase in the magnitude of the rainfall erosivity during this period. In this respect, Verstraeten et al. (2006) observed a significant increase of the R-factor in central Belgium for the period 1991–2002 compared to the period 1898–1990, and suggested that care must be taken when a single, invariant, value of R is adopted for simulating long-term scenarios of soil loss. In our experimental site, a statistical interpretation of R_i , based on the Mann-Kendall test and the linear trend test (Hirsch et al. 1992), established that an increasing trend for this variable can also be recognized at a level of probability $P \leq 0.10$ and this provides a further confirm of the above hypothesis. Similar results were obtained in a simulation study conducted by Pruski and Nearing (2002a) that explored the effects on soil erosion in three locations of the USA by combining changes of rainfall intensity and number of rainy days over time. In that case, the simulation scenarios obtained with CLIGEN, even if in line with our findings, were never confirmed by empirical evidence.

Fig. 6 – The annual values (R_i) of the R-rainfall erosivity factor obtained for the period 1954-2019 (a) and the annual values of rainfall measured in the same period (b)

However, the results summarized in Fig. 6 pose another important question whether an accurate estimate of R_i requires a proper relationship between rain intensity and rain kinetic energy or whether a simple correlation analysis between rainfall erosivity and rainfall amount can be adopted. In order to answer the above question, the annual rainfall Pa for the corresponding period (1954-2019) is also reported in Fig. 7-6. Surprisingly, the histograms of Fig. 7-6 show a decreasing trend of Pa in this area and a Cumulative Deviation Test suggested that this hypothesis cannot be rejected at a level of probability $P \leq 0.1$.

Fig. 7—The annual values of rainfall obtained for the period 1954-2019

These findings are really important because they suggest that a) the two variables (R_i and Pa) do not necessarily show the same temporal trends, and b) the R -factor cannot be predicted indirectly using rainfall data at annual scale but it is necessary to use the proper time intervals ($5 \text{ min} \leq \Delta t \leq 30 \text{ min}$) (Buffoni et al. 1999; Brunetti et al. 2001, 2002, 2004; Porto 2016). In other words, the above results indicate that the use of simplified models like those provided by Fournier (1960) or Arnoldus (1980) that are based on monthly and annual rainfall datasets, even if largely employed in many areas in the world (see, among the others, de Asis and Omasa 2007; Wolka et al. 2015; Cartacuzencu et al. 2016; González-

349 Morales et al. 2018; Wang et al. 2018; Pal and Chakraborty 2019) may not be adequate to predict the rainfall erosivity
350 in Mediterranean areas (Capra et al. 2017).

351 It is also important to notice that the CUSUM test (Trend, 2012) applied to the R_i dataset in Fig. 6 shows a distinct change
352 point in 2001 and this supports the hypothesis that the measurements of soil loss related to the study period 2006-2016
353 may not be representative of the long-term soil erosion in this area as they clearly overestimate soil loss (see Table 1).
354 Again, this seems to confirm that the length of the observation record has an important impact on soil erosion estimates
355 (Verstraeten et al. 2006) and suggests that care must be taken when a representative value of soil loss is requested for an
356 area with lacks of data. Similar problems occur when calibration and/or validation exercises are necessary to establish the
357 ability of a model to predict reliable values of soil erosion. For example, during the last 2-3 decades, alternative
358 approaches, based on the use of fallout radionuclides (FRN), including mainly cesium-137 (^{137}Cs) and unsupported lead-
359 210 ($^{210}\text{Pb}_{\text{ex}}$), proved to be very effective to assemble information on long-term and spatial patterns of erosion and
360 deposition rates especially if coupled with existing traditional methods (Di Stefano et al. 2005; Porto and Walling 2015).
361 These models need validation and the availability of a long-term representative value of soil erosion to be compared with
362 the model estimate is a key issue. In this respect, Porto and Walling (2012) carried out a sampling campaign for ^{137}Cs and
363 $^{210}\text{Pb}_{\text{ex}}$ analyses to estimate long-term soil erosion in the five plots used in this study. The overall results, updated to 2009,
364 indicated that the estimates provided by ^{137}Cs , related to the period 1954-2006, were systematically lower than the
365 measurements provided by the plots for the four-year period 2006-2009. The authors recognized that the four-year
366 measurements of soil loss may have overestimated soil erosion and emphasized the need to consider a longer dataset to
367 obtain a more reliable measured value. Also, a higher estimate of soil erosion obtained with the use of $^{210}\text{Pb}_{\text{ex}}$ suggested
368 a possible increase of soil erosion rates during the previous 15-20 years. These results are well in agreement with our
369 findings and suggest that the RUSLE model can be very effective for reconstructing long-term records of soil loss if
370 reliable input datasets are available.

371 Another important indication can be inferred from Fig. 5 that shows the trend of soil loss reconstructed for plot 5. ~~A-The~~
372 comparison with the ~~equivalent~~-estimates obtained from the other plots in Fig. 5 indicates that the amount of soil loss
373 related to plot 5 is much lower. This result reflects the lower value of C_m calculated for this plot and suggests that the
374 adoption of a proper strategy that includes the use of rotations with natural vegetation and conservative practices
375 (mulching, no-tillage etc.) can be effective in reducing soil loss. This assumption is confirmed by several studies in the
376 world that explored the effect of land use changes on soil loss (see, among the others, Maetens et al. 2012). In our case,
377 the mean value of A_i for plot 5, related to the long-term period 1954-2019, is equal to $12.0 \text{ (t ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1})$. This value is still
378 a little higher than that (ca. $11.5 \text{ t ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) assumed by Bagarello et al. (2015) as tolerable soil loss for similar geographic
379 contexts. However, it indicates that the adoption of the conservative practices described above allowed to reduce ~~it-soil~~

loss significantly considering that the equivalent value obtained for plot 3 is ca. three times higher (31.9 t ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹). This result is encouraging and suggests that an appropriate crop rotation is a key factor to minimize land degradation in these areas. In this respect, models like the RUSLE, based on empirical parameters of simple calculation, offer a good opportunity to predict soil loss for different scenarios and to evaluate possible countermeasures for long-term planning purposes.

5 CONCLUSIONS

The experimental plots used in this study provided important information on soil erosion rates obtained in an upland area of the Mediterranean environment. The first, important, result is related to the direct observations of soil loss obtained during the period of the experiment from 2006 to 2016. In this respect, the study demonstrated that direct measurements of soil loss can be misleading if the dataset cannot be extended for longer period. In order to avoid such problems, it is strongly suggested to account for long-term rainfall erosivity measurements in the absence of soil loss data. In the study area, the availability of rainfall data at short-time interval (5-30 minutes) from a local station allowed the calculation of the rainfall erosivity factor from 1954 to date. Based on this information, a RUSLE model was calibrated using the 11 years of soil loss measurements and it was applied to the extended period 1954-2019 to reconstruct the longer-term trend of soil erosion in the area. The overall results revealed that soil erosion has increased during this long-time window and showed a changing point at the beginning of the last two decades. These findings, in line with the results obtained from other authors, suggest that care must be taken when direct observations of soil loss are used for planning purpose as they could not be representative for the area under investigation for long-term periods. A second, important, result is related to the use of empirical models like RUSLE to predict soil loss for long periods. In this respect, the RUSLE model proved a good performance in its ability to reproduce soil loss rates in Mediterranean areas. However, the adoption of proper datasets of rainfall erosivity, derived from specific relationships between rainfall intensity and the *R*-factor, are strongly suggested and should be considered an essential tool to extend the representativeness of measurements.

Acknowledgements

This study has been finalized in the frame of Erasmus + KA2 - cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices - Capacity Building in the field of Higher Universities of Western Balkan Countries/SETOF. The authors are indebted to the ARPACAL for providing rainfall data used in this study. Thanks are also extended to both the anonymous referees and the Guest Editor for their useful comments.

Declarations

Formatted: Font: Italic

411 [Consent to participate. All authors consented to participate in the study.](#)

412 [Consent for publication. All authors consented to the publication of the article.](#)

413 [Conflict of interest. The authors declare no competing interests.](#)

414

415 **References**

- 416 Alexander LV (2016) Global observed long-term changes in temperature and precipitation extremes: A review of progress
417 and limitations in IPCC assessments and beyond. *Weather Clim Extremes* 11:4-16
- 418 Arnoldus HMJ (1980) An approximation of the rainfall factor in the USLE. In: *Assessment of Erosion*. England: Wiley
419 Chichester: 127–132
- 420 Bagarello V, Di Stefano C, Ferro V, Pampalone V (2010) Statistical distribution of soil loss and sediment yield at Sparacia
421 experimental area, Sicily. *Catena* 82:45-52
- 422 Bagarello V, Di Stefano C, Ferro V, Pampalone V (2015) Establishing a soil loss threshold for limiting rilling. *J Hydrol*
423 *Eng* 20(6):C5014001-1-C5014001-12
- 424 Bagarello V, Di Stefano C, Ferro V, Kinnel PIA, Pampalone V, Porto P, Todisco F (2011) Predicting soil loss on moderate
425 slopes using an empirical model for sediment concentration. *J Hydrol* 400:267-273
- 426 Bagarello V, Ferro V, Pampalone V, Porto P, Todisco F, Vergni L (2018) Predicting soil loss in central and south Italy
427 with a single USLE-MM model. *J Soils Sediments* 18(12):3365-3377
- 428 Bakker MM, Govers G, Kosmas C, Vanacker V, Van Oost K, Rounsevell M (2005) Soil erosion as a driver of land-use
429 change. *Agr Ecosyst Environ* 105:467–481
- 430 Boardman J (2006) Soil erosion science: Reflections on the limitations of current approaches. *Catena* 68:73-86
- 431 Boardman J, Poesen J (2006) *Soil Erosion in Europe*. Wiley, Chichester. 878 pp
- 432 Brunetti M, Colacino M, Nanni T (2001) Trend in the daily intensity of precipitation in Italy from 1951 to 1996. *Int J*
433 *Climatol* 21:299–316
- 434 Brunetti M, Maugeri M, Nanni T, Navarra A (2002) Droughts and extreme events in regional daily Italian precipitation
435 series. *Int J Climatol* 22:1455–1471
- 436 Brunetti M, Buffoni L, Mangianti F, Maugeri M, Nanni T (2004) Temperature, precipitation and extreme events during
437 the last century in Italy. *Global Planet Change* 40:141–149
- 438 Buffoni L, Maugeri M, Nanni T (1999) Precipitation in Italy from 1833 to 1996. *Theor Appl Climatol* 63:33–40
- 439 Capra A, Porto P, La Spada C (2017) Long-term variation of rainfall erosivity in Calabria (Southern Italy). *Theor Appl*
440 *Climatol* 128(1-2):141-158

Cartacuzencu S, Coman A, Rosu G, Tincu R, Lazar G (2016) Analysis of hydric erosion produced by the Siret River, Romania during 1989-2008. *Environ Eng Manag J* 15:537-544

Cerdan O, Govers G, Le Bissonnais Y, Van Oost K, Poesen J, Saby N, Gobin A, Vacca A, Quinton J, Auerswald K, Klik A, Kwaad F J P M, Raclot D, Ionita I, Rejman J, Rousseva S, Muxart T, Roxo M J, Dostal T (2010) Rates and spatial variations of soil erosion in Europe: A study based on erosion plot data. *Geomorphology* 122:167–177

Chaplot V (2007) Water and soil resources response to rising levels of atmospheric CO₂ concentration and to changes in precipitation and air temperature. *J Hydrol* 337:159-171

Cinnirella S, Iovino F, Porto P, Ferro V (1998) Anti-erosive effectiveness of Eucalyptus coppices through the cover management factor estimate. *Hydrol Process* 12(4):635-649

De Araújo JC, Güntner A, Bronstert A (2006) Loss of reservoir volume by sediment deposition and its impact on water availability in semiarid Brazil. *Hydrolog Sci J* 51(1):157-170

de Asis A M, Omasa K (2007) Estimation of vegetation parameter for modeling soil erosion using linear Spectral Mixture Analysis of Landsat ETM data. *ISPRS J Photogramm Remote Sens* 62:309-324

Di Stefano C, Ferro V, Porto P. (1999) Linking sediment yield and caesium-137 spatial distribution at basin scale. *J Agric Eng Res* 74:41–62

Di Stefano C, Ferro V, Porto P, Rizzo S (2005) Testing a spatially distributed sediment delivery model (SEDD) in a forested basin by caesium-137 technique. *J Soil Water Conserv* 60(3):148–157

Du D, Zhao X, Huang R (2017) The impact of climate change on developed economies. *Econ Lett* 153:43-46

Evans R (1995) Some methods of directly assessing water erosion of cultivated land – a comparison of measurements made on plots and in fields. *Prog Phys Geog* 19(1):115–129

Favis-Mortlock D, Boardman J (1995) Nonlinear responses of soil erosion to climate change: A modeling study on the UK South Downs. *Catena* 25:365-387

Ficklin D L, Luo Y, Luedeling E, Zhang M (2009) Climate change sensitivity assessment of a highly agricultural watershed using SWAT. *J Hydrol* 374(1):16–29

Foster GR, McCool DK, Renard KG, Moldenhauer WC (1981) Conversion of the universal soil loss equation to SI metric units. *J Soil Water Conserv* 36(6):355-359

Fournier F (1960) *Climat et erosion*. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris

González-Morales SB, Mayer A, Ramírez-Marcial N (2018) Assessment of soil erosion vulnerability in the heavily populated and ecologically fragile communities in Motozintla de Mendoza, Chiapas, Mexico. *Solid Earth* 9:745-757

471 Hirsch RM, Helsel DR, Cohn TA, Gilroy EJ (1992) Statistical analysis of hydrologic data. In: Maidment DR (ed)
 472 Handbook of Hydrology, McGraw-Hill, pp. 1711-1730

473 IPCC (2018) Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C, <https://www.ipcc.ch/reports/> October 2018

474 Karl TR, Knight RW (1998) Secular Trends of Precipitation Amount, Frequency, and Intensity in the United States. Bull
 475 Am Meteorol Soc 79:231-241

476 Khodadadi M, Zaman M, Mabit L, Blake WH, Gorji M, Bahrami AS, Meftahi M, Porto P (2020) Exploring the potential
 477 of using ⁷Be measurements to estimate soil redistribution rates in semi-arid areas: results from Western Iran and
 478 Southern Italy. J Soils Sediments 20(9):3524-3536

479 Loughran RJ (1989) The measurement of soil erosion. Prog Phys Geogr 13:216-233

480 Maetens W, Poesen J, Vanmaercke M (2012) How effective are soil conservation techniques in reducing plot runoff and
 481 soil loss in Europe and the Mediterranean? Earth-Sci Rev 115:21–36

482 Mason SJ, Waylen PR, Mimmack GM, Rajaratnam B, Harrison JM (1999) Changes in extreme rainfall events in South
 483 Africa. Clim Change 41:249–257

484 McCool DK, Brown LC, Foster GR, Mutchler CK, Meyer LD (1987) Revised slope steepness factor for the universal soil
 485 loss equation. Trans ASAE 30(5):1387-1396

486 McCool DK, Foster GR, Mutchler CK, Meyer LD (1989) Revised slope length factor for the Universal Soil Loss
 487 Equation. Trans ASAE 32(5):1571-1576

488 ~~Miyan MA (2015) Droughts in Asian Least Developed Countries: Vulnerability and sustainability. Weather Clim~~
 489 ~~Extremes 7:8-23~~

490 Moberg A, Jones PD (2005) Trends in indices for extremes in daily temperature and precipitation in central and western
 491 Europe. Int J Climatol 25:1149– 1171

492 Nearing MA, Foster GR, Lane LJ, Finkner SC (1989) A process-based soil erosion model for USDA- water erosion
 493 prediction project technology. Trans ASAE 32:1587–1593

494 Osborn TJ, Hulme M, Jones PD, Basnett TA (2000) Observed trends in the daily intensity of United Kingdom
 495 precipitation. Int J Climatol 20:347–364

496 Pal SC, Chakraborty R (2019) Simulating the impact of climate change on soil erosion in sub-tropical monsoon
 497 dominated watershed based on RUSLE, SCS runoff and MIROC5 climatic model. Adv Space Res 64:352–377

498 Palmer MA, Lettenmaier DP, Poff NL, Postel SL, Richter B, Warner R (2009) Climate Change and River Ecosystems:
 499 Protection and Adaptation Options. Environ Manage 44:1053–1068

500 Pandey BK, Gosain AK, Paul G, Khare D (2017) Climate change impact assessment on hydrology of a small watershed
 501 using semi-distributed model. Appl Water Sci 7:2029–2041

Field Code Changed

502 Pimentel D, Harvey C, Resosudarmo P, Sinclair K, Kurz D, McNair M, Crist S, Shpritz L, Fitton L, Saffouri L, Blair R
 503 (1995) Environmental costs of soil erosion and conservation benefits. *Science* 267:1117–1123
 504 Porto P (2016) Exploring the effect of different time resolutions to calculate the rainfall erosivity factor R in Calabria,
 505 southern Italy. *Hydrol Process* 30:1551-1562
 506 Porto P, Callegari G (2021) Using ⁷Be measurements to explore the performance of the SEDD model to predict sediment
 507 yield at event scale. *Catena* 196: 104904
 508 Porto P, Walling DE (2012) Validating the use of ¹³⁷Cs and ²¹⁰Pb_{ex} measurements to estimate rates of soil loss from
 509 cultivated land in southern Italy. *J Environ Radioact* 106:47-57
 510 Porto P, Walling DE (2015) Use of caesium-137 Measurements and long-term records of sediment load to calibrate the
 511 sediment delivery component of the SEDD model and explore scale effect: examples from Southern Italy. *J Hydrol*
 512 *Eng* 20(6)
 513 Porto P, Walling DE, La Spada C, Callegari G (2016) Validating the use of ¹³⁷Cs measurements to derive the slope
 514 component of the sediment budget of a small catchment in southern Italy. *Land Degrad Dev* 27:798–810
 515 Porto P, Walling DE, Callegari G (2018) Using repeated ¹³⁷Cs and ²¹⁰Pb_{ex} measurements to establish sediment budgets
 516 for different time windows and explore the effect of connectivity on soil erosion rates in a small experimental
 517 catchment in Southern Italy. *Land Degrad Dev* 29:1819-1832
 518 Preiti G, Romeo M, Bacchi M, Monti M (2017) Soil loss measure from Mediterranean arable cropping systems: Effects
 519 of rotation and tillage system on C-factor. *Soil Till Res* 170:85–93
 520 Pruski FF, Nearing MA (2002a) Runoff and soil loss changes expected for changes in precipitation patterns under global
 521 climate change. *J Soil Water Conserv* 57:7-16
 522 Pruski FF, Nearing MA (2002b) Climate-induced changes in erosion during the 21st century for eight U.S. locations.
 523 *Water Resour Res* 38(12):1298, doi:10.1029/2001WR000493
 524 Renard KG, Foster GR, Yoder DC, McCool DK (1994) RUSLE revisited: status, questions, answers, and the future. *J*
 525 *Soil Water Conserv* 49:213-220
 526 Renard KG, Foster GR, Weesies GA, McCool DK, Yoder DC (1997) Predicting Soil Erosion by Water: A Guide to
 527 Conservation Planning with the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE), *Agric. Handbk.*, vol. 703, U. S.
 528 Dep. of Agric., Washington, D. C.
 529 Romero-Díaz A, Ruiz-Sinoga JD, Robledano-Aymerich F, Brevik EC, Cerdà A (2017) Ecosystem responses to land
 530 abandonment in Western Mediterranean Mountains. *Catena* 149:824-835
 531 Shao Z, Sumari NS, Portnov A, Ujoh F, Musakwa W, Mandela PJ (2021) Urban sprawl and its impact on sustainable
 532 urban development: a combination of remote sensing and social media data. *Geo Spat Inf Sci* 24(2):241-255

533 Shiferaw B, Tesfaye K, Kassie M, Abate T, Prasanna BM, Menkir A (2014) Managing vulnerability to drought and
534 enhancing livelihood resilience in sub-Saharan Africa: Technological, institutional and policy options. *Weather*
535 *Clim Extremes* 3:67-79

536 Suppiah R, Hennessy KJ (1998) Trends in total rainfall, heavy rain events and numbers of dry days in Australia, 1910–
537 1990. *Int J Climatol* 18:1141–1164

538 Verstraeten G, Poesen J, Demaree G, Salles C (2006) Long-term (105 years) variability in rain erosivity as derived from
539 10- min rainfall depth data for Ukkel (Brussels, Belgium): implications for assessing soil erosion rates. *J Geophys*
540 *Res* 111:D22

541 Wang M, Baartman JE, Zhang H, Yang Q, Li S, Yang J, Cai C, Wang M, Ritsema CJ, Geissen V (2018) An integrated
542 method for calculating DEM-based RUSLE LS. *Earth Sci Inform* 11:579–590

543 Wen Y, Schoups G, van de Giesen N (2017) Organic pollution of rivers: Combined threats of urbanization, livestock
544 farming and global climate change. *Nature Sci Rep* 7:43289

545 Wischmeier WH, Johnson CB, Cross BV (1971) A soil erodibility nomograph for farmland and construction sites. *J Soil*
546 *Water Conserv* 26:189-193

547 Wischmeier WH, Mannering JV (1969) Relation of soil properties to its erodibility. *Soil Sci Soc Am Proc* 39:131-137

548 Wischmeier WH, Smith DD (1978) Predicting Rainfall-erosion Losses. A Guide to Conservation Farming, vol. 537. US
549 Dept. of Agric., Agr. Handbook, pp. 151

550 Wolka K, Tadesse H, Garedew E, Yimer F (2015) Soil erosion risk assessment in the Chaleleka wetland watershed,
551 Central Rift Valley of Ethiopia. *Environ Syst Res* 4:1-12

552 Yi Y, Wang Z, Zhang K, Yu G, Duan X (2008) Sediment pollution and its effect on fish through food chain in the Yangtze
553 River. *Int J Sediment Res* 23(4):338-347

Table 1

	R (MJ mm ha ⁻¹ h ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹)	K (t ha h ha ⁻¹ MJ ⁻¹ mm ⁻¹)	Cm	LS	A_i (2006-2016) (t ha ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹)	A_i (1954-2019) (t ha ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹)
Plot 1	5032	0.011	1.00	1.20	69.5	56.1
Plot 2			0.38	1.27	28.6	22.5
Plot 3			0.50	1.36	39.2	31.9
Plot 4			0.41	1.35	32.2	25.7
Plot 5			0.21	1.25	14.4	12.0

Figure Captions

Fig. 1 The study area and the experimental plots

Fig. 2 Values of soil loss obtained from each plot for the study period 2006-2016. The graph in (a) shows the frequency distribution of the annual values. The box plot in (b) indicates the data distribution

Fig. 3 Calculation of the soil erodibility factor K

Fig. 4 The frequency distribution of C_i for each plot. The dashed line represents a log-normal theoretical distribution

Fig. 5 The annual soil loss reconstructed for each plot for the period 1954-2019. Grey bars indicate the estimated values while white bars report the measured values obtained for the study period

Fig. 6 The annual values (R_i) of the rainfall erosivity factor obtained for the period 1954-2019 (a) and the annual values of rainfall measured in the same period (b)




Figure 2

