



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

Early warning indicators of changes in soil ecosystem functioning.

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

*Original*

Early warning indicators of changes in soil ecosystem functioning / Settineri, G., Attina', E., Muscolo, A.M..  
- In: ECOLOGICAL INDICATORS. - ISSN 1470-160X. - 48:48(2014), pp. 542-549.  
[10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.09.017]

*Availability:*

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12318/5941> since: 2021-03-11T15:44:27Z

*Published*

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.09.017>

The final published version is available online at: <https://www.sciencedirect>.

*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)

1 **Early warning indicators of changes in soil ecosystem functioning**

2

3 Muscolo A.\* Settineri G. E Attinà

4 Agriculture Department, “Mediterranea” University, Feo di Vito 89122-Reggio Calabria Italy

5

6 e-mail: [amuscolo@unirc.it](mailto:amuscolo@unirc.it);

7

8 \*Corresponding author:

9 Prof. Adele Muscolo

10 Agriculture Department

11 “Mediterranea” University of Reggio Calabria

12 Feo di Vito 89122, Reggio Calabria ITALY

13 Tel: 0965/897799

14 Fax: 0965/312827

15 e-mail: [amuscolo@unirc.it](mailto:amuscolo@unirc.it)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 **Abstract**

25 In the last decades soil are facing numerous environmental threats and climatic changes that are  
26 causing a rapid decline of soil fertility and biodiversity. Soil organic matter (SOM), has the most  
27 widely recognized influence on soil quality, but it hardly puts in evidence processes associated to the  
28 new soil threats, because of its insensitivity in assessing soil quality changes in the short-term. A series  
29 of chemical and biochemical analyses were carried out in agricultural and forestry soil ecosystems  
30 subjected to different threats, to identify the parameters that better evidence changes in soil  
31 characteristics in a short term, but the identification of basic universal indicators and the choice of the  
32 number of estimated measures are still under investigation and discussion. The main aim of this paper  
33 was to identify biochemical markers to be used routinely and applicable to different soil ecosystems, as  
34 early warning indicators of alteration in soil ecosystem functioning. The results obtained allowed to  
35 identify three indicators, microbial biomass (MBC), water soluble phenols (WSP), and fluorescein  
36 diacetate hydrolase (FDA), as effective tools in the evaluation of soil quality changes in the short term,  
37 showing also a threat-indicator specificity. MBC reflected changes mainly induced by abiotic stress,  
38 FDA displayed modification caused by climate, and WSP pointed out alteration due to the organic  
39 amendment.

40

41 **Keywords** Agriculture ecosystem. Biological indicators. Forest ecosystem. Soil organic matter. Soil  
42 quality.

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 **1. Introduction**

50 Soils are the most significant non-renewable geo-resource we have and that are facing numerous  
51 environmental threats while trying to resist to climatic changes. Interest in evaluating the quality and  
52 health of our soils has been stimulated by increasing awareness that soil is a critical important  
53 component of the earth's biosphere, functioning not only in the production of food and fiber but also in  
54 the maintenance of global sustainability and environmental balance (Glanz, 1995). Soil is also the basis  
55 of agricultural and of natural plant communities. Thus, the thin layer of soil covering the surface of the  
56 earth represents the difference between survival and extinction for most land-based life (Doran et al.,  
57 1996). Whilst the majority of countries have criteria to evaluate the quality of the air and water, the  
58 same does not occur for the quality of the soil. Traditionally, soil quality is associated with  
59 productivity (Karlen et al., 1997), but recently it has been defined in terms of sustainability (Toth et al.,  
60 2007), that is, the capacity of the soil to absorb, store and recycle water, minerals and energy in such a  
61 way that the production of the crops can be maximized and environmental degradation minimized.  
62 Nevertheless, a significant decline in soil quality has occurred throughout the entire world as a result of  
63 adverse changes in its physical, chemical and biological properties, caused by human activity and  
64 climate changes (Van Camp et al., 2004; EC 2006). According to Steer (1998), in the last decades of  
65 the last century, about 2 billion of the 8.7 billion agricultural lands, permanent pastures, forests and  
66 wild native lands have been degraded. Soil degradation processes constitute a serious problem on a  
67 worldwide basis, with significant environmental, social and economic consequences. Many economic  
68 activities such as agriculture, industry and tourism depend both directly and indirectly on soil quality,  
69 which has been proposed as a prime indicator for characterizing and defining management factors  
70 contributing to soil degradation. Many constraints cause short-term disturbances that are detrimental to  
71 soil quality (IPCC 2007; EEA-JRC-WHO, 2008) as they increase the emissions of greenhouse gases  
72 (i.e., CO<sub>2</sub>, NO, or N<sub>2</sub>O), cause nitrate accumulation and leaching, and/or modify soil microbial  
73 community structure in a way that decreases the retention of organic C and N (Liu et al., 2006).  
74 Generally, soil quality has been related to the SOM (Gao et al., 2013), microbial activity, total  
75 nitrogen, and C/N ratio (Molope and Page, 1986; Eash et al., 1994; Roberson et al., 1995; Murphy et  
76 al., 2011), but these soil parameters not necessarily change as a result of changing external conditions  
77 or use (Muscolo et al., 2014 in press), and hardly address short term changes in soil processes  
78 associated to the new environmental threats. To rise the challenge of soil resource degradation, there is  
79 an urgent need to develop common, simple and transparent method to identify changes in soil

80 characteristics in response to the main environmental constraints. Soil-quality assessment, based on  
81 inherent soil factors and focused on dynamic aspects of soil system (Paz-Ferreiro and Fu, 2014 in  
82 press; Muscolo et al., 2014 in press) is an effective method for evaluating the environmental  
83 sustainability (Hamblin, 1991) of land use and management activities. In these scenarios, the overall  
84 goal of this paper was to compare data on soils subjected to different types of use and environmental  
85 constraints, in order to find out biochemical markers to be used routinely and applicable to different  
86 soil ecosystems, as early warning indicators of changes in soil ecosystem functioning. A series of  
87 chemical and biochemical analyses were carried out in forest managed soils, amended agriculture soils,  
88 soil irrigated with brackish water and forest soil influenced by seasonal variation to identify the  
89 parameters that better reflect changes in soil quality, in the short term. The assessment was  
90 comparative because of the lack of specific criteria or guidelines available in the literature for  
91 interpretation of most soil property indices measured. The starting hypothesis was that natural soils  
92 have developed, over time, an equilibrium with the environment reaching the maximum quality and  
93 the greatest degree of balance in their properties (Fedoroff, 1987), but soil use and the new  
94 environmental constraints alter this balance by affecting soil biochemical properties even in a short  
95 time. (Fedoroff, 1987).

## 96 **2. Material and Method**

### 97 *2.1 Experiments and soil sampling*

98 Four separate experiments were carried out to identify early warning indicators that better reflect  
99 changes in soil chemistry and biochemistry parameters related to soil quality. The experiments were  
100 conducted both in forest and agriculture soils underwent to different management practices and  
101 climate. The first experiment (named **Case study 1**) was conducted in field, in order to evaluate the  
102 effects of artificial brackish water at different concentrations (0; 0.5%; 1%; 1.5%) on chemical and  
103 biochemical properties of a haplic Kastanozem (IUSS, 2006) located in the Agricultural Farm of  
104 ‘‘Mediterranea University’’, Reggio Calabria, Southern Italy. Soil during the dry season (June, July  
105 and August), have been irrigated, three time a week, with synthetic brackish water (EC 4 dS m<sup>-1</sup>)  
106 prepared using NaHCO<sub>3</sub>, NaCl, Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>, and MgSO<sub>4</sub> with Cl:SO<sub>4</sub> ratio of 1:1 and Ca:Mg ratios of 4:1  
107 to maintain the 70% of field capacity. Three months after the irrigations with brackish water, soil  
108 samples were collected and analyzed for the chemical and biochemical parameters. Six composite soil

109 samples (0-20 cm) for each treatment were taken from the Agricultural farm of Mediterranea  
110 University of Reggio Calabria Italy. The samples were brought to the laboratory on the same day of the  
111 collection, and kept in the refrigerator at 4 °C for up to 24 h until processing. Prior to the soil analysis,  
112 except for FDA hydrolysis and MBC, all the soil samples were air-dried, sieved (<2 mm), and visible  
113 roots were removed.

114 The second experiment (named **Case study 2**) was performed in climatic chamber for 40 days, in  
115 plastic pots (10 cm diameter×7 cm height). The soil (Haplic Kastanozem) used was taken from the  
116 Agricultural farm of Mediterranea University of Reggio Calabria Italy, in spring. Each pot was filled  
117 with 350 g of soil, in order to evaluate the effects of amendment with digestate at different  
118 concentrations (0, 25, 50, 75 %) on soil chemical and biochemical properties. The digestate was  
119 obtained by a bio-gas energy plant with 998 kW<sub>el</sub> of installed power, supplied with animal manure  
120 (poultry, cow and sheep), milk serum, maize silage and in minor amount with olive waste and citrus  
121 pulp. During the experiment, the soil humidity was maintained at 70% of the field capacity in all  
122 treatments. The soils differently treated (6 replicates), were air-dried and sieved (<2mm) prior to the  
123 chemical analysis. Soil samples for the biochemical determination (microbial biomass and enzyme  
124 activities) were stored in the refrigerator at 4 °C for up to 24h until processing.

125 The third experiment (named **Case study 3**) was carried out in field, in the Calabrian Apennine Forest,  
126 Southern Italy, to investigate if artificial gaps and in particular the size of the gaps affected the soil  
127 chemical and biochemical parameters related to natural forest regeneration. The research area was in  
128 the Regional Park of Serre (Calabrian Apennines, Southern Italy at an elevation of 900–940 m. Soils,  
129 were classified as Haplic Phaeozem (IUSS, 2006). The natural forest is dominated by silver fir (*Abies*  
130 *alba* Mill) and beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L). In this forest, three small (185 m<sup>2</sup>) and three medium (410  
131 m<sup>2</sup>) gaps were created by felling trees and removing boles. The treatments were named as follow: A=  
132 medium gaps; B= canopy cover sites; C= small gaps. Gap sites were paired with an adjacent site under  
133 canopy cover. Soil were sampled 3 months after gap opening and were analyzed for chemical and  
134 biochemical properties. Soil samples were collected from 0 to 30 cm depth in each gap and in its  
135 adjacent forest canopy cover site. Each soil sample consisted of a mixture of six sub-samples taken at  
136 random. Prior to the soil analysis, except for soil moisture content, microbial biomass and FDA, all soil  
137 samples were air-dried and sieved (<2 mm).

138 The fourth experiment (named **Case study 4**) was carried out in field. The study area was located in  
139 the Peripoli Mountain (San Lorenzo) of Aspromonte Mountains (Calabria, Southern Italy), 1270 m  
140 above sea level. The climate is predominantly Mediterranean, with dry hot summers and cold winters.

141 The average seasonal precipitation are typically highest during the winter (1100) and autumn (1500)  
142 compared to spring (900) and summer (600). The soil were Haplic Phaeozem (IUSS, 2006) with a  
143 xeric soil regime moisture and a vegetal cover of *Pinus laricio* Poiret ssp. Calabrica. The effects of  
144 seasons (autumn, winter, spring and summer) were evaluated on soil chemical and biochemical  
145 parameters as described below. Soil profiles were carefully excavated, different (layers) horizons were  
146 thoroughly separated from the top to the bottom of the profile on the basis of morphological  
147 differences that could be perceived by the naked eye. Every 15 days, soil samples (1 kg) were taken  
148 from each horizon over a year (24 times in a year). The samples were brought to the laboratory on the  
149 same day of the collection, and kept in the refrigerator at 4 °C for up to 24 h until processing. Prior to  
150 the soil analysis, except for FDA hydrolysis and MBC, all the soil samples were air-dried, sieved  
151 (<2 mm), and visible roots were removed. Data presented are the means of three replicate  
152 determinations.

153

## 154 2.2 Soil Chemical Analysis

155 Organic C was estimated by the Walkley–Black procedure (Nelson and Sommers, 1982) and was  
156 converted to organic matter by multiplying the percentage of C by 1.72; total N was measured by the  
157 Kjeldahl method (Bremner and Mulvaney, 1982). Humic substances were extracted with 0.1 N NaOH  
158 (solid:liquid ratio 1:10); the suspension was shaken for 16 h at room temperature and centrifuged at  
159 5,000 rpm for 30 min; the extract was dialysed by Wisking tubes against distilled water to pH 6.0.  
160 Subsequently, the solution was filtered through a column of Amberlite IR 120 H<sup>+</sup>. The fractionation of  
161 humic substances was carried out as follows: aliquots of extracts were acidified to pH 2.0 with dilute  
162 H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>; the humic acids precipitated and were removed by centrifugation, while the fulvic acids  
163 corresponded to the supernatants (Bettany et al. 1980). The C content of humic and fulvic acids was  
164 determined by dichromate oxidation (Nelson and Sommers 1982). Phenols were extracted with  
165 distilled water as this is the most realistic extractant in allelopathic studies (Kaminsky and Muller  
166 1977, 1978). Thirty grams of dry weight samples were mixed in 200 ml distilled water and shaken at  
167 75 rev min<sup>-1</sup> for 20 h at room temperature. Solutions were filtered through Whatman's No 1 paper. All  
168 samples were extracted in triplicate. Total water-soluble phenols (monomeric and polyphenols) were  
169 determined by using the Folin–Ciocalteu reagent, following the method of Box (1983). Tannic acid  
170 was used as a standard and the concentration of water-soluble phenolic compounds was expressed as  
171 tannic acid equivalents ( $\mu\text{g TAE g}^{-1} \text{ D.W.}$ ).

172 *2.3 Soil Biochemical Analysis*

173 The amount of microbial biomass C (MBC) was determined by using the chloroform fumigation–  
174 extraction procedure (Vance et al. 1987) with field moist samples (equivalent to 20 g D.W.). The  
175 filtered soil extracts of both fumigated and unfumigated samples were analyzed for soluble organic C  
176 using the methods of Walkley and Black (1934). MBC was estimated on the basis of the differences  
177 between the organic C extracted from the fumigated soil and that from the unfumigated soil, and an  
178 extraction efficiency coefficient of 0.38 was used to convert soluble C into biomass C (Vance et al.  
179 1987).

180 Enzymatic assay: Dehydrogenase (DH) activity was determined by the method of von Mersi and  
181 Schinner (1991). Briefly, to a sample of fresh soil equivalent to 1 g of oven dried (105° C) soil were  
182 added 1.5 ml of 1 M Tris–HCl buffer of pH 7.5 followed by 2 ml of 0.5% INT solution (Sigma product  
183 No I 8377), and the suspension was kept at 40 C for 1 h. Then 10 ml of extractant (methanol) was  
184 added and the samples were mixed using a vortex mixer, and then left in the dark for 10 min. Finally,  
185 the solids were filtered out (Whatman’s no 40 paper), and the absorbance of the filtrate was determined  
186 at 490 nm.

187 Alkaline and acid phosphatase (AlPh, AcPh) activities were determined on 1 g (fresh weight) aliquots  
188 of soil, according to the method of Tabatabai (1982). Enzyme activities are expressed as  $\mu\text{g } p$ -  
189 nitrophenol produced by 1 g of dry soil in one hour ( $\mu\text{g } p\text{-nitrophenol g}^{-1}\text{ h}^{-1}$ ).

190 FDA hydrolysis reaction was determined according to the methods of Adam and Duncan (2001).  
191 Briefly, to 2 g of soil (fresh weight, sieved <2 mm) 15 ml of 60 mM potassium phosphate pH 7.6 and  
192 0.2 ml 1000 mg FDA  $\text{ml}^{-1}$  were added. The flask was then placed in an orbital incubator at 30 °C for  
193 20 min. Once removed from the incubator, 15 ml of chloroform/methanol (2:1 v/v) was added to  
194 terminate the reaction. The content of the flask was centrifuged at 2000 rpm for 3 min. The supernatant  
195 was filtered and the filtrates measured at 490 nm on a spectrophotometer (Shimadzu UV–Vis 2100,  
196 Japan). Hydrolysing coefficient (Hc): mmol of fluorescein diacetate hydrolysed/mmol of total  
197 fluorescein diacetate before hydrolysis (Perucci, 1992).

198 Urease (URE) was determined according to the method of Kandeler and Gerber (1988). Soil (5 g fresh  
199 weight) was mixed with 2.5 ml of urea (80 mM) and 20 ml 0.1 M borate buffer pH (10.0). The mixture  
200 was allowed to react for 2 h in an orbital shaker at 37 °C. After incubation, pipette 2.5 ml of urea to the  
201 control, add 30 ml of KCl (2 M) to both sample and control, and shake for 30 min. Filter the contents  
202 of the flasks through folded filters. Aliquots of 1 ml of the filtered solution were mixed with 9 ml of

203 distilled water, 5 ml of sodium/salicylate solution, and 2 ml of dichloroisocyanuric acid (Na<sup>+</sup> salt). The  
204 colour intensity of the solution was measured at 690 nm. Ammonium concentrations were determined  
205 by using a calibration curve of ammonium chloride standard solution.

206 Beta-glucosidase activity was detected according to the method of Valášková et al. (2007). Soil (1 g  
207 fresh weight) was placed into a plastic tube and treated with 4 mL of modified universal buffer (MUB,  
208 pH 6). The reaction mixture contains 0.16 ml of 1.2mM PNP-substrate (p-nitrophenyl-β-d-glucoside)  
209 in 50mM sodium acetate buffer (pH 5.0) and 0.04 ml of the sample. Reaction mixtures were incubated  
210 at 40°C for 20–120 min. After incubation the reaction was stopped and the yellow color from the  
211 p-nitrophenol was developed by the addition of 0.1 ml of 0.5M sodium carbonate, The p-nitrophenol  
212 was measured by absorption on a spectrophotometer at a wavelength of 400 nm and quantified by  
213 comparison with a standard curve.

#### 214 *2.4 Statistical analysis*

215 One-way ANOVA was used to test the effects of the factors (treatments) on soil indexes for each case  
216 study separately. Treatment means were compared using Tukey's test (Sokal and Rohlf, 1981). All  
217 statistical analyses were performed using Systat v. 8.0 software package (SPSS Inc, Evanston, Ill,  
218 USA). In order to calculate the correlation coefficients between SOM and MBC, FDA and WSP  
219 indexes of the SOM, MBC, FDA and WSP were calculated as follows:

220  $\text{Index Y} = Y \times \text{Depth (cm)} / 100$

221  $\text{Index } Y_{\text{whole profile}} = \text{the sum of the individual index}$

222  $Y = \text{SOM, MBC, FDA, WSP}$

223

### 224 **3. Results**

#### 225 *3.1 Case study 1*

226 Table 1 shows the chemical properties related to the soil treated with different salinity concentrations.  
227 There were no significant changes related to organic matter and its fraction (humic and fulvic carbon)  
228 between the soil irrigated with freshwater and the soil irrigated with different concentrations of  
229 brackish water. No significant variations were observed for total nitrogen, for C/N ratio and for WSP  
230 content between the control soil and the treatments. The brackish water treatments affected only in part

231 the enzymatic tissue of the soil. In particular, as shown in Table 2, dehydrogenase activity decreased in  
232 soil irrigated with brackish water at the concentrations of 1 and 1.5 %, while the AcP activity  
233 decreased only at the highest salinity concentration (1.5%). No significant differences were observed in  
234 the activities of the other enzymes between the control and the treatments. Significant differences were  
235 instead observed in the MBC contents not only between the treatments and the control, but also among  
236 the treatments themselves. Increasing the salinity percentage, the MBC amount significantly and  
237 gradually decreased, reaching a 76% reduction in the presence of 1.5 % brackish water.

238

### 239 *3.2 Case Study 2*

240 The digestate used, had the following characteristic: total solid 25%, total solid volatile 79%. pH 8.4,  
241 electric conductivity 1707  $\mu\text{S cm}^{-1}$ , total carbon 43 % ss, organic matter 74 % ss, total nitrogen 5.3%  
242 ss, C/N 8.1 (Table 3). 40 days after the application of the different amounts of digestate to the soil, no  
243 significant differences were observed in the organic matter, HC, FC, N contents, and in the values of  
244 C/N ratio. The quantity of water soluble phenols significantly increased increasing the percentage of  
245 digestate added to the soil, putting well in evidence significant differences among the treatments  
246 themselves. The data related to the biological parameters, enzyme activities and MBC, did not change  
247 between the treated and untreated soils (Table 4).

248

### 249 *3.3 Case study 3*

250 The data of soil chemical properties (Table 5) evidenced significant differences in organic matter trend,  
251 between gaps and the adjacent under canopy cover sites, but not between medium and small gaps.  
252 Within small and medium gaps a lower amount of organic matter compared to the adjacent sites under  
253 canopy cover was observed. A similar trend was observed for FC, no significant differences between  
254 the gaps of different sizes and forest were observed for HC content. The amount of total nitrogen was  
255 significantly higher in the medium gaps. The values of C/N ratio were quite similar between the gaps  
256 of different sizes but it was significantly different between the gaps and under canopy cover sites. No  
257 significant variation in the content of WSP between managed and unmanaged soils was observed.  
258 FDA (Table 6) was the biological parameter that changed on the basis of the management, showing  
259 significant variations among medium gap, small gap and under canopy cover site. Conversely, no  
260 significant differences were observed in the activities of the other enzymes among the gaps themselves  
261 and between gaps and under canopy cover site.

262

### 263 3.4 Case study 4

264 In each season, variations in SOM, HC, FC, N, C/N and WSP along the soil profiles were observed:  
265 the greatest amount of these soil properties were detected in the litter layer, and then they declined  
266 consistently with the soil depth. Comparing each horizon with its counterpart in the different seasons  
267 no significant differences were observed for SOM, N, C/N and WSP. No significant variation in HC  
268 and FC were observed in the horizons between the adjacent seasons, e.g. between summer and spring  
269 or between winter and autumn. Significant differences were appreciable comparing the data detected in  
270 winter or autumn with those detected in summer or spring. (Table 7). A similar trend was observed for  
271 the parameters reflecting the biochemical properties of soils (Table 8), in each season, variations in soil  
272 enzyme activities and MBC contents along the profiles were observed, the greatest enzymatic activities  
273 and the higher MBC content were detected in the litter layer and then they declined, with depth,  
274 consistently. No significant differences in the biochemical properties were observed comparing each  
275 horizon with its counterpart between the contiguous seasons. The differences were noticeable only  
276 between the very different seasons. FDA was the only biochemical parameter able to put in evidence  
277 the variations in soil due not only to the soil depth, but moreover to the seasons, in particular FDA  
278 evidenced differences between summer and spring or winter and autumn that all the other parameters  
279 considered have not been able to show.

280 In addition, in each case study, our data showed a highly significant correlation between SOM and  
281 MBC, FDA and WSP. (Table 9). In agriculture soils (case studies 1 and 2) the correlations were  
282 positive between SOM, FDA and WSP and negative between SOM and MBC. Conversely, in forest  
283 soils, the correlations were positive between SOM, MBC and FDA, and negative between SOM and  
284 WSP. The results of ANOVA, showed also that the biological parameter most affected in each case  
285 study was also more correlated to the SOM than the other ones. In the case study 1 MBC was the  
286 parameter most affected by salinity and most correlated with SOM (Table 9), in the case study 2 WSP,  
287 was the parameter most affected by digestate treatment, and most correlated with SOM, in the case  
288 studies 3 and 4 FDA was the parameter most affected by management and seasonal changes and most  
289 correlated with SOM (Table 9).

290

## 291 4. Discussion

292 Interest in evaluating the quality and health of our soil resources has been stimulated by increasing  
293 awareness that soil is a critically important component of the earth's biosphere, functioning not only in  
294 the production of food and fiber but also in the maintenance of local, regional, and global  
295 environmental quality (Glanz, 1995). In a changing world, assessment of soil quality/health is needed  
296 to identify problem in the production areas (Thomsen et al., 2012), to monitor changes in sustainability  
297 and environmental quality related to agricultural management for making realistic estimates of food  
298 production, and to assist government agencies in formulating and evaluating sustainable agricultural  
299 and land-use policies (Granatstein and Bezdicek, 1992). Use of current methods for assessing or  
300 indexing soil quality is fraught with complexity and precludes its practical or meaningful use by land  
301 managers or policy makers (Harris et al., 1996). Our results evidenced that soil organic matter, most  
302 widely recognized influencing soil quality and, typically used as a measure of soil health, hardly  
303 evidenced the processes associated to the new soil constraints, because of its insensitivity to assess soil  
304 quality changes in the short-term. However, SOM has a number of fractions (phenolic compounds,  
305 microbial biomass, and enzymes) with different functional roles in soil (Zagal et al., 2009) which could  
306 provide a measure of subtle, or early changes in soil quality. Our results showed that MBC, WSP, and  
307 FDA are highly correlated to the SOM and are sensitive to external changes, in the short term, much  
308 more than SOM itself, thus they are suitable to be used as early indicator of changes in soil ecosystem.  
309 Our results, in agreement with Ji et al. (2014) showed an inverse correlation between SOM and MBC  
310 in agriculture soils, due to the tillage practice that decreased the amount of soil microorganisms much  
311 more quickly than organic matter. The inverse correlation observed in forest soils between SOM and  
312 water soluble phenols independently by treatments, evidenced that the humification process prevailed  
313 in these sites. It is the first time, that MBC, WSP, and FDA may be directly related to changes caused  
314 by specific external factors (soil management practices and/or environmental conditions), showing an  
315 index-factor specificity. FDA was the only biological parameter that changed in forest soils over  
316 seasons, and in respect to gap opening, showing a particular sensitivity to the climatic and/or  
317 pedoclimatic variations (temperature and moisture). These results are fully in agreement with previous  
318 findings showing that FDA is the soil biological parameter most affected by environmental factors  
319 (Sicardi et al., 2004; Pesaro et al., 2004; Son et al., 2006; Sumalan et al., 2010; Muscolo et al., 2014 in  
320 press). Additionally, our data didn't show a relationship between FDA and MBC amount, suggesting  
321 that FDA does not reflect the amount of total microbial biomass, but the amount of the active biomass  
322 of the soils (Schnurer and Rosswall, 1982; Araujo et al., 2003), that is stimulated by soil moisture and  
323 temperature. As reported by Smit et al. (2001) environmental constraints and seasonal variations

324 influence qualitatively soil community composition, causing considerable fluctuations in the bacteria  
325 community (Terry, 1980; Kara and Bolat, 2009), the main component of the active microbial biomass  
326 and the main producers of hydrolytic soil enzymes (Emimol et al., 2012). Our results evidenced that  
327 MBC was the only soil biological property that rapidly changed under increasing salinity. Many  
328 authors (Pankhurst et al., 2001; Mamilov et al., 2004; Yuan et al., 2007; Corstanje et al., 2007;  
329 Chowdhury et al., 2011) have already demonstrated that MBC responded to salinity stress,  
330 irrespectively of the soil C content. The simple explanation for this was that high salt concentrations in  
331 the soil solution increase the external osmotic potential (Harris, 1980), the ion toxicity (Keren, 2000),  
332 and the ion competition causing a negative impact on the size and on the activity of soil microbial  
333 biomass (Rietz and Haynes, 2003; Tripathi et al., 2006; Yuan et al., 2007; Mavi et al., 2012). WSP,  
334 component of the light fraction of the organic matter (Nierop and Buurman, 1998; Riffaldi et al.,  
335 2003), changed in a short time after the addition of digestate, pointing out soil alteration due to the  
336 organic amendments that other chemical and biochemical soil parameters were not able to evidence  
337 quickly. The changes in the size of WSP may have caused significant shifts in the structure and in the  
338 function of the microbial community, not reflected in the total MBC, which in turn influence the SOM  
339 mineralization and the viability of the soil for agriculture. In short this light fraction of soil organic  
340 matter can be consider a useful early indicator of management-related carbon (C), and can be used to  
341 describe the effects of compost amendments to soil (Grandy et al., 2002; Carter et al., 2004; Lynch et  
342 al., 2005; Dale et al., 2008).

343

## 344 **Conclusion**

345 There are several biological soil properties that can be used as soil quality indicators, alone or in  
346 combination with other chemical or physical properties. However they are far from being universal and  
347 should be chosen according to the situation under consideration. On the other hand there are several  
348 soil properties sensitive to management changes but difficult to determine and to interpret. The basic  
349 indicators and the number of estimated measures are still under investigation. In this study, we have  
350 identified MBC, WSP, and FDA as effective tools in the evaluation of soil quality to understand soil  
351 performance and processes in the short term, putting in evidence for the first time a threat-indicator  
352 specificity. The use of specific and appropriate indicators, is useful to predict the dynamic behavior of

353 soil processes and the impact of management practices and/or climate in the short term, saving time  
354 and money, helping to develop management strategies to shift soil conditions in a positive direction.

355

## 356 **Acknowledgements**

357 This study was founded by THE INTERREG IV C EUROPEAN PROJECT- Robinwood-Plus  
358 Calabria and by Coop. Fattoria della Piana Soc. Agr. C.da Sovereto, Candidoni (RC), Italy. We  
359 thank two anonymous reviewers for their very constructive comments and suggestions on the  
360 presentation of the manuscript.

361

## 362 **References**

363 Adam, G., Duncan, H. 2001. Development of a sensitive and rapid method for the measurement of  
364 total microbial activity using fluorescein diacetate (FDA) in a range of soils, *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 33,  
365 943–951.

366 Araujo, A.S.F, Monteiro, R.T.R., Abarkeli, R.B. 2003. Effect of glyphosate on soil microbial activity  
367 of two Brazilian soils. *Chemosphere* 52: 799-804.

368 Bettany, J.R., Saggar, S., Stewart, J.W.B. 1980. Comparison of the amount and forms of sulphur in soil  
369 organic matter fractions after 65 years of cultivation. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 44,70–75.

370 Box, J.D. 1983. Investigation of the Folin–Ciocalteu reagent for the determination of polyphenolic  
371 substances in natural waters. *Water Res.* 17, 511–525.

372 Bremner, J.M., Mulvaney, C.S. 1982. Nitrogen-total. In: Page AL, Miller RH, Keeney DR (Eds)  
373 *Methods of soil analysis*. American Society of Agronomy, Madison, pp. 595–624.

374 Carter, M.R., Sanderson, J.B., and MacLeod, J.A. 2004. Influence of compost on the physical  
375 properties and organic matter fractions of a fine sandy loam throughout the cycle of a potato rotation.  
376 *Can. J. Soil Sci.* 84, 211–218.

377 Corstanje, R., Reddy, K.R., Prenger, J.P., Newman, S., Ogram, A.V. 2007. Soil microbial eco-  
378 physiological response to nutrient enrichment in a sub-tropical wetland. *Ecol. Ind.* 7: 277–289.

379 Chowdhury, N., Marschner, P., Burns, R.G. 2011. Soil microbial activity and community composition:  
380 Impact of changes in matric and osmotic potential. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 43, 1229–1236. doi:10.1016/  
381 j.soilbio.2011.02.012.

382 Dale, V.H., Peacock, A.D., Garten Jr., C.T., Sobek, E., Wolfe, A.K. 2008. Selecting  
383 indicators of soil, microbial, and plant conditions to understand ecological changes in Georgia pine  
384 forests. *Ecol. Ind.* 8: 818–827.

385 Doran, J.W., Parkin, T.B., 1996. Quantitative indicators of soil quality: a minimum data set. In:  
386 Doran, J.W., Jones, A.J. (Eds.), *Methods for Assessing Soil Quality*. Soil Sci. Soc. Am., Special  
387 Publication 49, Madison, WI, pp. 25–37.

388 Eash, N.S., Karlen, D.L., Parkin, T.B. 1994. Fungal contributions to soil aggregation and soil quality.  
389 *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Special Publication No. 35*, 221-228.

390 EC. 2006. SEC (2006) 620, 2006. Commission Staff Working Document. Document Accompanying  
391 the Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European  
392 Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - Thematic Strategy for Soil  
393 Protection. Impact Assessment of the Thematic Strategy for Soil Protection. Commission of the  
394 European Communities. Brussels, 22.9.2006.

395 EEA-JRC-WHO, 2008. Impacts of Europe's changing climate— 2008 indicator based assessment.  
396 EEA Report No 4/2008.

397 Emimol, A., Ganga, G., Parvathy, R., Radhika, G., Nair, G.M. 2012. Screening of Microbes  
398 producing extracellular hydrolytic enzyme from corporation waste dumping site and house hold waste  
399 for the enhancement of bioremediation methods *IOSR-J.P.B.S.* 4, 54–60 ISSN: 2278-3008.

400 Fedoroff, N. 1987. The production potential of soils. Part 1. Sensitivity of principal soil types to the  
401 intensive agriculture of north-western Europe, in: E. Barth, P. L'Hermite: *Scientific Basis for Soil*  
402 *Protection in the European Community*. Elsevier Press, London, pp. 65-86.

403 Gao, Y-C., Wang, J-C., Xu, J-b., Kong, X., Zhao, L., Zeng, D.H. 2013. Assessing the quality of oil  
404 contaminated saline soil using two composite indices. *Ecol. Ind.* 24: 105-122.

405 Glanz, J.T. 1995. *Saving Our Soil: Solutions for Sustaining Earth's Vital Resource*. Johnson Books,  
406 Boulder, CO, USA.

407 Granatstein, D., Bezdicek, D.F. 1992. The need for a soil quality index: local and regional  
408 perspectives. *Am. J. Altern. Agric.* 7, 12–16.

409 Grandy, A.S., Porter, G.A., Erich, M.S. 2002. Organic amendment and rotation crop effects on the  
410 recovery of soil organic matter and aggregation in potato cropping systems. *Soil Sci. Am. J.* 66,1311-  
411 1319.

412 Hamblin, A., 1991. Environmental indicators for sustainable agriculture. Report of a national  
413 workshop. Publ. LWRRDC and GRDC, pp.96

414 Harris, R.F. 1980. Effect of water potential on microbial growth and activity. In ‘Water potential  
415 relations in soil microbiology’. Special edn 9. (Eds) JF Parr, WR Gardner) Soil Sci. Soc. Am.:  
416 Madison, WI. pp. 23–95.

417 Harris, R.F., Karlen, D.L., Mulla, D.J. 1996. A conceptual framework for assessment and management  
418 of soil quality and health. In: Doran, J.W., Jones, A.J. (Eds.), Methods for Assessing Soil Quality. Soil  
419 Sci. Soc. Am., Special Publication 49, Madison, WI, pp. 61–82.

420 IPCC, 2007. Chapter 4- Ecosystems, their properties, goods and services. In: Climate Change 2007:  
421 Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment  
422 Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, M.L. Parry, O.F. Canziani, J.P. Palutikof,  
423 P.J. van der Linden and C.E. Hanson, Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 7–22.

424 IUSS Working Group WRB. 2006. World reference base for soil resources 2006. 2nd edition. World  
425 Soil Resources Reports No. 103. FAO, Rome. ISBN 92-5-105511-4 pp 128.

426 Ji, B., Hu, H., Zhao, Y., Mu, X., Liu, K., Li, C. 2014. Effects of Deep Tillage and Straw Returning on  
427 Soil Microorganism and Enzyme Activities. Sci. World J. ID 451493, 12 pages  
428 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2014/451493>.

429 Kaminsky, R., Muller, W.H. 1977. The extraction of soil phytotoxins using a neutral EDTA solution.  
430 Soil Sci. 124(4), 205–210.

431 Kaminsky, R., Muller, W.H. 1978. A recommendation against the use of alkaline soil extraction in the  
432 study of allelopathy. Plant Soil 49, 641–645

433 Kandeler, E., Gerber, H. 1988. Short-term assay of soil urease activity using colorimetric  
434 determination of ammonium, Biol. Fert. Soils 6, 68–72.

435 Kara, O., Bolat, I. 2009. Short-term effects of wildfire on microbial biomass and abundance in black  
436 pine plantation soils in Turkey. Ecol. Ind. 9: 1151-1155.

437 Karlen, D.L., Mausebach, M.J., Doran, J.W., Cline, R.G., Harris, R.F., Schuman, G.E. 1997. Soil  
438 quality: a concept, definition, and framework for evaluation. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 61, 4–10.

439 Keren, R. 2000. Salinity. In ‘Handbook of soil science’. (Ed. ME Sumner) pp. 3–25. (CRC Press: Boca  
440 Raton, FL)

441 Liu, X., Herbert, S.J., Hashemi, A.M., Zhang, X., Ding, G. 2006. Effects of agricultural management  
442 on soil organic matter and carbon transformation – a review. Plant Soil Environ. 52 (12), 531–543.

443 Lynch, D.H., Voroney, R.P., and Warman, P.R. 2005. Soil physical properties and organic matter  
444 fractions under forages receiving composts, manure or fertilizer. *Compost Sci. Util.* 13, 252–261.

445 Mamilov, A., Dilly, O.M., Mamilov, S., Inubushi, K. 2004. Microbial ecophysiology of degrading aral  
446 sea wetlands: Consequences for C-cycling. *Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.* 50, 839–842. doi:10.1080/00380768.  
447 2004.10408544

448 Mavi, M.S., Marschner, P., Chittleborough, D.J., Cox, J.W., Sanderman, J. 2012. Salinity and sodicity  
449 affect soil respiration and dissolved organic matter dynamics differentially in soils varying in texture.  
450 *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 45, 8–13. doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2011.10.003

451 Molohe, M.B., Page, E.R., 1986. The contributions of fungi, bacteria and physical processes in the  
452 development of aggregate stability of a cultivated soil. *Biol. Agr. Hort.* 3, 233–249.

453 Murphy D. V., Cookson W.R., Braimbridge M., Marschner, P., Jones, D.L., Stockdale, E.A., Abbott,  
454 L.K. 2011. Relationships between soil organic matter and the soil microbial biomass (size, functional  
455 diversity, and community structure) in crop and pasture systems in a semi-arid environment. *Soil Res.*  
456 49(7) 582-594.

457 Muscolo, A., Panuccio MR., Mallamaci, C., Sidari, M. 2014. Biological indicators to assess short-term  
458 soil quality changes in forest ecosystems. *Ecol. Ind.*

459 Nelson, D.W., Sommers, L.E. 1982. Total carbon, organic carbon, and organic matter. In: Page, A.L.,  
460 Miller, R.H., Keeney, D.R. (Eds) *Methods of soil analysis*. American Society of Agronomy, Madison,  
461 pp 539–579.

462 Nierop, K.G.J., Buurman, P. 1998. Composition of soil organic matter and its water-soluble fraction  
463 under young vegetation on drift sand, central Netherland. *Eur. J. Soil Sci.* 49(4), 605–615.

464 Pankhurst, C.E., Yu, S., Hawke, B.G., Harch, B.D. 2001. Capacity of fatty acid profiles and substrate  
465 utilization patterns to describe differences in soil microbial communities associated with increased  
466 salinity or alkalinity at three locations in South Australia. *Biol. Fert. Soils* 33, 204–217.  
467 doi:10.1007/s003740000309

468 Papendick, R.I., Parr, J., 1992. Soil quality — the key to a sustainable agriculture. *Am. J. Altern.*  
469 *Agric.* 7, 2–3.

470 Paz-Ferreiro, J., Fu, S., in press. Biological indices for soil quality evaluation: Perspectives and  
471 Limitations. *Land Degrad. Develop.* Doi: 10.1002/ldr.2262.

472 Perucci, P. 1992. Enzyme activity and microbial biomass in a field soil amended with municipal  
473 refuse, *Biol. Fert. Soils* 14, 54–60.

474 Pesaro, M., Nicollier, G., Zeyer, J., Widmer, F. 2004. Impact of Soil Drying-Rewetting Stress on  
475 Microbial Communities and Activities and on Degradation of Two Crop Protection Products. *Appl.*  
476 *Environm. Microbiol.* 70, 2577–2587

477 Pierzynski, G.M., Sims, J.T., Vance, G. 1994. *Soils and Environmental Quality*. Lewis Publishers,  
478 CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, USA.

479 Riffaldi, R., Saviozzi, A., Levi-Minzi, R, Cardelli R. 2003. Conventional crop management effects on  
480 soil organic matter characteristics *Agronomie* 23, 45–50.

481 Rietz, D.N., Haynes, R.J. 2003. Effects of irrigation-induced salinity and sodicity on soil microbial  
482 activity. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 35, 845–854. doi:10.1016/S0038-0717(03)00125-1

483 Roberson, E.B., Sarig, S., Shennan, C., Firestone, M.K., 1995. Nutritional management of microbial  
484 polysaccharide production and aggregation in an agricultural soil. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 59, 1587–1594.

485 Schnurer, J. Rosswall, T. 1982. Fluorescein Diacetate Hydrolysis as a Measure of Total Microbial  
486 Activity in Soil and Litter. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 1982, 1256–1261.

487 Sicardi, M., Garcia-Prechac, F., Frioni, L. 2004. Soil microbial indicators sensitive to land use  
488 conversion from pastures to commercial *Eucalyptus grandis* (Hill ex Maiden) plantations in Uruguay.  
489 *Appl. Soil Ecol.* 27, 125–133.

490 Smit, E., Leeflang, P., Gommans, S., Van den Broek, J., Vans, M.S., Wernars, K. 2001. Diversity and  
491 seasonal fluctuations of the dominant members of the bacterial soil community in a wheat field as  
492 determined by cultivation and molecular methods. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 67, 2284–2291.

493 Sokal, R.R., Rohlf, F.J. 1969. *Biometry*, 1st edn. Freeman, San Francisco pp. 250

494 Son, Y., Seo, K.Y., Kim, R.H., Kim, J. 2006. Soil respiration and FDA hydrolysis following  
495 conversion of abandoned agricultural lands to natural vegetation in central Korea. *J. Plant Biol.* 49,  
496 231–236.

497 Steer, A. 1998. Making development sustainable. *Adv. Geo-Ecol.* 31, 857–865, ISSN: 0145 8752.

498 Șumălan, R.M., Alexa, E., Negrea, M., Doncean, A. 2010. Comparative study on biological activity  
499 and edaphic microflora composition for four soil types from SDE Timisoara. *Res. J. Agr. Sci.* 42 (3),  
500 324–327.

501 Tabatabai, M.A. 1982. Soil enzymes, in: A.L. Page, R.H. Miller, D.R. Keeney (Eds.), *Methods of*  
502 *Soil Analyses, Part 2, Chemical and Microbiological Properties*, American Society of Agronomy,  
503 Madison, WI, 1982, pp. 491–515.

504 Terry, R.E. 1980. Variation in microbial activity in Histosols and its relationship to soil moisture.  
505 *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 40, 313–317.

506 Thomsen, M., Faber J.H., Sorensen, P.G. 2012. Soil ecosystem health and services – Evaluation of  
507 ecological indicators susceptible to chemical stressors. *Ecol. Ind.* 16: 67–75.

508 Tóth, G., Stolbovoy, V., Montanarella, L. 2007. Soil Quality and Sustainability Evaluation - An  
509 integrated approach to support soil-related policies of the European Union. EUR 22721 EN. pp. 40  
510 Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg. ISBN 978-92-79-05250-7

511 Tripathi, S., Kumari, S., Chakraborty, A., Gupta, A., Chakrabarti, K., Bandyopadhyay, B.K. 2006.  
512 Microbial biomass and its activities in salt-affected coastal soils. *Biol. Fert. Soils* 42, 273–277.  
513 doi:10.1007/s00374-005-0037-6

514 Valášková, V., Šnajdr, J., Bittner, B., Cajthaml, T., Merhautová, V., Hoffichter, M., Baldrian, P. 2007.  
515 Production of lignocellulose-degrading enzymes and degradation of leaf litter by saprotrophic  
516 basidiomycetes isolated from a *Quercus petraea* forest. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 39, 2651–2660.

517 Van Camp, L., Bujjarabal, B., Gentile, A.R., Jones, R.J.A, Montanarella, L., Olazabal, C. Selvaradjou,  
518 S.K. 2004. Reports of the Technical Working Groups Established under the Thematic Strategy for Soil  
519 Protection. EUR 21319 EN/1, pp. 872. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities,  
520 Luxemburg.

521 Vance, E.D., Brookes, P.C., Jenkinson, D.S. 1987. An extraction method for measuring soil microbial  
522 biomass C. *Soil Biol Biochem.* 19,703–707.

523 von Mersi, W., Schinner, F. 1991. An improved and accurate method for determining the  
524 dehydrogenase activity of soils with idonitrotetrazolium chloride, *Biol. Fert. Soils* 11, 216–220.

525 Walkley, A., Black, I.A. 1934. An examination of the Degtjareff method for determining soil organic  
526 matter and a proposed modification of the chromic acid titration method. *Soil Sci.* 37, 29–38.

527 Yuan, B.C., Li, Z.Z., Liu, H., Gao, M., Zhang, Y.Y. 2007. Microbial biomass and activity in salt  
528 affected soils under and conditions. *Appl, Soil Ecol.* 35, 319–328. doi:10.1016/j.apsoil.2006.07.004

529 Zagal, E., Munoz C., Quiroz M., Cordova C. 2009. Sensitivity of early indicators for evaluating  
530 quality changes in soil organic matter. *Geoderma*, 151, 191–198.

531

532 **Table 1.** Chemical characteristics of brackish-water irrigated soils. Organic Matter (OM %); Humic  
 533 Carbon (HC %); Fulvic Carbon (FC%); Total Nitrogen (N %); Total Phenols (WSP  $\mu\text{g TAE g}^{-1}$  dry  
 534 soil). Numbers denote the standard errors (n=6) Means with the same letters are not significantly  
 535 different (Tukey's test.  $p \leq 0.05$ )

<b>Treatment</b>	<b>OM</b>	<b>HC</b>	<b>FC</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>C/N</b>	<b>WSP</b>
0%	2.25 $\pm$ 0.1 <sup>a</sup>	0.78 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.50 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.12 $\pm$ 0.009 <sup>a</sup>	10.90 $\pm$ 2.3 <sup>a</sup>	44 $\pm$ 2.5 <sup>a</sup>
0.5%	2.36 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.81 $\pm$ 0.1 <sup>a</sup>	0.51 $\pm$ 0.1 <sup>a</sup>	0.13 $\pm$ 0.008 <sup>a</sup>	10.55 $\pm$ 2.4 <sup>a</sup>	45 $\pm$ 3.1 <sup>a</sup>
1.0%	2.49 $\pm$ 0.1 <sup>a</sup>	0.79 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.49 $\pm$ 0.1 <sup>a</sup>	0.12 $\pm$ 0.003 <sup>a</sup>	12.0 $\pm$ 1.8 <sup>a</sup>	42 $\pm$ 3.5 <sup>a</sup>
1.5%	2.51 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.84 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.53 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.12 $\pm$ 0.003 <sup>a</sup>	13.1 $\pm$ 1.0 <sup>a</sup>	50 $\pm$ 4.5 <sup>a</sup>

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543 **Table 2.** Microbial Biomass (MBC  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1}$  soil), fluorescein diacetate (FDA) hydrolysis (fluorescein  
 544 released,  $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$  dry soil; acid phosphatase and alkaline phosphatase (Ac and Ak. P.  $\mu\text{g p-nitrophenol}$   
 545  $\text{g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ ) and urease (URE  $\mu\text{g NH}_4^+\text{-N g}^{-1}\text{dry soil } 2 \text{ h}^{-1}$ ), dehydrogenase (DH  $\mu\text{g INTF g}^{-1}$  dry soil  $\text{h}^{-1}$ )  $\beta$ -  
 546 glucosidase ( $\beta$ -GLU  $\mu\text{g p-nitrophenol g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ ) activities, in brackish-water irrigated soils. Numbers  
 547 denote the standard errors (n=6) Means with the same letters are not significantly different (Tukey's  
 548 test.  $p \leq 0.05$ ).

549

550

<b>Treatment</b>	<b>FDA</b>	<b>DH</b>	<b><math>\beta</math>-GLU</b>	<b>URE</b>	<b>Ac.P</b>	<b>Ak.P</b>	<b>MBC</b>
<b>0%</b>	42.0 $\pm$ 1.4 <sup>a</sup>	57 $\pm$ 1.5 <sup>a</sup>	71 $\pm$ 3.5 <sup>a</sup>	84.30 $\pm$ 1.9 <sup>a</sup>	250 $\pm$ 3.9 <sup>a</sup>	332 $\pm$ 3.9 <sup>a</sup>	862.2 $\pm$ 3.7 <sup>a</sup>
<b>0.5%</b>	44.1 $\pm$ 0.9 <sup>a</sup>	55 $\pm$ 1.3 <sup>a</sup>	69 $\pm$ 2.8 <sup>a</sup>	80.95 $\pm$ 1.5 <sup>a</sup>	255 $\pm$ 3.5 <sup>a</sup>	334 $\pm$ 2.8 <sup>a</sup>	631.5 $\pm$ 2.9 <sup>b</sup>
<b>1.0%</b>	44.2 $\pm$ 1.4 <sup>a</sup>	48 $\pm$ 1.2 <sup>b</sup>	69 $\pm$ 3.1 <sup>a</sup>	81.40 $\pm$ 0.9 <sup>a</sup>	251 $\pm$ 1.9 <sup>a</sup>	340 $\pm$ 5.1 <sup>a</sup>	401.2 $\pm$ 1.6 <sup>c</sup>
<b>1.5%</b>	43.7 $\pm$ 1.3 <sup>a</sup>	35 $\pm$ 1.0 <sup>c</sup>	67 $\pm$ 2.3 <sup>a</sup>	82.15 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>a</sup>	195 $\pm$ 2.1 <sup>b</sup>	341 $\pm$ 2.6 <sup>a</sup>	201.5 $\pm$ 1.4 <sup>d</sup>

551

552

553

554

555 **Table 3.** Chemical characteristics of soil treated with different concentration of digestate. Organic  
 556 Matter (OM %); Humic Carbon (HC %); Fulvic Carbon (FC%); Total Nitrogen (N %); Total Phenols  
 557 (WSP  $\mu\text{g TAE g}^{-1}$  dry soil). Numbers denote the standard errors (n=9) Means with the same letters are  
 558 not significantly different (Tukey's test.  $p \leq 0.05$ )

Treatment	OM	HC	FC	N	C/N	WSP
<b>0</b>	2.29±0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.77±0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.52±0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.12±0.008 <sup>a</sup>	11.1±2.3 <sup>a</sup>	41±2.5 <sup>d</sup>
<b>25%</b>	2.30±0.1 <sup>a</sup>	0.75±0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.58±0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.12±0.009 <sup>a</sup>	11.1±2.0 <sup>a</sup>	55±3.5 <sup>c</sup>
<b>50%</b>	2.33±0.3 <sup>a</sup>	0.62±0.1 <sup>a</sup>	0.60±0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.13±0.007 <sup>a</sup>	10.4±1.8 <sup>a</sup>	66±2.9 <sup>b</sup>
<b>75%</b>	2.36±0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.63±0.1 <sup>a</sup>	0.68±0.1 <sup>a</sup>	0.15±0.005 <sup>a</sup>	9.2±2.5 <sup>a</sup>	98±2.9 <sup>a</sup>

559 **Table 4.** Microbial Biomass (MBC  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1}$  soil), fluorescein diacetate (FDA) hydrolysis (fluorescein  
 560 released,  $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$  dry soil; acid phosphatase and alkaline phosphatase (Ac and Ak. P.  $\mu\text{g } p\text{-nitrophenol}$   
 561  $\text{g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ ) and urease (URE  $\mu\text{g NH}_4^+\text{-N g}^{-1}\text{dry soil } 2 \text{ h}^{-1}$ ), dehydrogenase (DH  $\mu\text{g INTF g}^{-1}$  dry soil  $\text{h}^{-1}$ )  
 562  $\beta$ -glucosidase ( $\beta$ -GLU  $\mu\text{g } p\text{-nitrophenol g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ ) activities, in soil treated with different concentration  
 563 of digestate. Numbers denote the standard errors (n=9) Means with the same letters are not  
 564 significantly different (Tukey's test.  $p \leq 0.05$ )

565

566

<b>Treatment</b>	<b>FDA</b>	<b>DH</b>	<b><math>\beta</math>-GLU</b>	<b>URE</b>	<b>Ac.P</b>	<b>Ak.P</b>	<b>MBC</b>
<b>0%</b>	42.4 $\pm$ 1.5 <sup>a</sup>	59.5 $\pm$ 1.5 <sup>a</sup>	78 $\pm$ 4.2 <sup>a</sup>	87.9 $\pm$ 2.2 <sup>a</sup>	248 $\pm$ 3.5 <sup>a</sup>	339 $\pm$ 3.0 <sup>a</sup>	860 $\pm$ 3.4 <sup>a</sup>
<b>25%</b>	43.5 $\pm$ 2.5 <sup>a</sup>	59.4 $\pm$ 1.6 <sup>a</sup>	82 $\pm$ 2.5 <sup>a</sup>	89.4 $\pm$ 2.0 <sup>a</sup>	248 $\pm$ 3.0 <sup>a</sup>	340 $\pm$ 2.0 <sup>a</sup>	865 $\pm$ 3.0 <sup>a</sup>
<b>50%</b>	41.9 $\pm$ 2.1 <sup>a</sup>	62.1 $\pm$ 1.8 <sup>a</sup>	81 $\pm$ 3.1 <sup>a</sup>	91.1 $\pm$ 2.3 <sup>a</sup>	247 $\pm$ 3.5 <sup>a</sup>	344 $\pm$ 3.0 <sup>a</sup>	860 $\pm$ 5.0 <sup>a</sup>
<b>75%</b>	43.9 $\pm$ 2.8 <sup>a</sup>	63.5 $\pm$ 2.5 <sup>a</sup>	84 $\pm$ 4.0 <sup>a</sup>	92.4 $\pm$ 2.5 <sup>a</sup>	246 $\pm$ 3.0 <sup>a</sup>	345 $\pm$ 3.0 <sup>a</sup>	858 $\pm$ 3.4 <sup>a</sup>

567

568 **Table 5.** Chemical characteristics of soil in gaps and under canopy cover sites. Organic Matter (OM %);  
 569 Humic Carbon (HC %); Fulvic Carbon (FC%); Total Nitrogen (N %); Total Phenols (WSP  $\mu\text{g TAE g}^{-1}$  dry  
 570 soil). Numbers denote the standard errors (n=9) Means with the same letters are not significantly different  
 571 (Tukey's test,  $p \leq 0.05$ ) A: medium gaps; B: canopy cover sites; C: small gaps.

572

Treatment	OM	HC	FC	N	C/N	WSP
<b>A</b>	7.0 $\pm$ 0.1 <sup>b</sup>	2.70 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>a</sup>	1.36 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>b</sup>	0.50 $\pm$ 0.008 <sup>a</sup>	8.1 $\pm$ 2.3 <sup>b</sup>	255 $\pm$ 2.7 <sup>a</sup>
<b>B</b>	11 $\pm$ 0.5 <sup>a</sup>	3.08 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>a</sup>	2.03 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.35 $\pm$ 0.009 <sup>b</sup>	18.2 $\pm$ 2.0 <sup>a</sup>	252 $\pm$ 2.2 <sup>a</sup>
<b>C</b>	7.2 $\pm$ 0.3 <sup>b</sup>	2.62 $\pm$ 0.1 <sup>a</sup>	1.39 $\pm$ 0.2 <sup>b</sup>	0.38 $\pm$ 0.007 <sup>b</sup>	11.0 $\pm$ 1.8 <sup>b</sup>	254 $\pm$ 2.6 <sup>a</sup>

573

574

575

576 **Table 6.** Microbial Biomass (MBC  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1}$  soil), fluorescein diacetate (FDA) hydrolysis (fluorescein  
577 released,  $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$  dry soil; acid phosphatase and alkaline phosphatase (Ac and Ak. P.  $\mu\text{g } p\text{-nitrophenol}$   
578  $\text{g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ ) and urease (URE  $\mu\text{g NH}_4^+\text{-N g}^{-1}\text{dry soil } 2 \text{ h}^{-1}$ ), dehydrogenase (DH  $\mu\text{g INTF g}^{-1}$  dry soil  $\text{h}^{-1}$ )  
579  $\beta$ -glucosidase ( $\beta$ -GLU  $\mu\text{g } p\text{-nitrophenol g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ ) activities, in gaps and under canopy cover sites.  
580 Numbers denote the standard errors (n=9) Means with the same letters are not significantly different  
581 (Tukey's test,  $p \leq 0.05$ ) A: medium gaps, B: canopy cover sites, C: small gaps.

582

Treatment	FDA	DH	$\beta$ -GLU	URE	Ac.P	Ak.P	MBC
A	0.701 $\pm$ 0.05 <sup>b</sup>	55.5 $\pm$ 1.0 <sup>a</sup>	80 $\pm$ 2.1 <sup>a</sup>	133 $\pm$ 2.3 <sup>a</sup>	448 $\pm$ 3.5 <sup>a</sup>	366 $\pm$ 3.0 <sup>a</sup>	1258 $\pm$ 4.5 <sup>a</sup>
B	0.950 $\pm$ 0.03 <sup>a</sup>	56.4 $\pm$ 1.3 <sup>a</sup>	82 $\pm$ 2.0 <sup>a</sup>	135 $\pm$ 3.0 <sup>a</sup>	451 $\pm$ 3.0 <sup>a</sup>	369 $\pm$ 2.0 <sup>a</sup>	1266 $\pm$ 5.0 <sup>a</sup>
C	0.805 $\pm$ 0.01 <sup>c</sup>	54.1 $\pm$ 1.5 <sup>a</sup>	83 $\pm$ 1.9 <sup>a</sup>	131 $\pm$ 2.8 <sup>a</sup>	447 $\pm$ 3.5 <sup>a</sup>	365 $\pm$ 3.0 <sup>a</sup>	1259 $\pm$ 5.0 <sup>a</sup>

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591

592

593

594 **Table 7.** Changes in forest soil chemical characteristics under *Pinus laricio* plantation over season.  
 595 Organic Matter (OM %); Humic Carbon (HC %); Fulvic Carbon (FC%); Total Nitrogen (N %); Total  
 596 Phenols (WSP  $\mu\text{g TAE g}^{-1}$  dry soil). Numbers denote the standard errors (n=18) Means with the same  
 597 letters are not significantly different (Tukey's test.  $p \leq 0.05$ )

Season	Horizon	Depth (cm)	OM	HC	FC	N	C/N	WSP
Autumn	Oi	5-0	34.4 <sup>a</sup>	6.23 <sup>a</sup>	1.10 <sup>b</sup>	0.87 <sup>a</sup>	23 <sup>a</sup>	285 <sup>a</sup>
	Ah <sub>1</sub>	0-30	6.3 <sup>b</sup>	2.60 <sup>c</sup>	0.95 <sup>c</sup>	0.23 <sup>b</sup>	16 <sup>b</sup>	108 <sup>b</sup>
	Ah <sub>2</sub>	30-50	4.9 <sup>c</sup>	2.50 <sup>c</sup>	0.91 <sup>c</sup>	0.18 <sup>c</sup>	16 <sup>b</sup>	84 <sup>c</sup>
Winter	Oi	5-0	34.1 <sup>a</sup>	6.15 <sup>a</sup>	1.06 <sup>b</sup>	0.81 <sup>a</sup>	24 <sup>a</sup>	287 <sup>a</sup>
	Ah <sub>1</sub>	0-30	5.9 <sup>b</sup>	2.61 <sup>c</sup>	0.94 <sup>c</sup>	0.21 <sup>b</sup>	16 <sup>b</sup>	103 <sup>b</sup>
	Ah <sub>2</sub>	30-50	4.7 <sup>c</sup>	2.51 <sup>c</sup>	0.90 <sup>c</sup>	0.17 <sup>c</sup>	16 <sup>b</sup>	87 <sup>c</sup>
Spring	Oi	5-0	33.0 <sup>a</sup>	3.90 <sup>b</sup>	1.50 <sup>a</sup>	0.80 <sup>a</sup>	24 <sup>a</sup>	299 <sup>a</sup>
	Ah <sub>1</sub>	0-30	6.0 <sup>b</sup>	1.05 <sup>d</sup>	0.78 <sup>d</sup>	0.22 <sup>b</sup>	16 <sup>b</sup>	99 <sup>b</sup>
	Ah <sub>2</sub>	30-50	5.0 <sup>c</sup>	0.88 <sup>f</sup>	0.62 <sup>e</sup>	0.17 <sup>c</sup>	17 <sup>b</sup>	88 <sup>c</sup>
Summer	Oi	5-0	33.9 <sup>a</sup>	3.81 <sup>b</sup>	1.45 <sup>a</sup>	0.83 <sup>a</sup>	24 <sup>a</sup>	290 <sup>a</sup>
	Ah <sub>1</sub>	0-30	6.5 <sup>b</sup>	0.99 <sup>e</sup>	0.80 <sup>d</sup>	0.22 <sup>b</sup>	17 <sup>b</sup>	99 <sup>b</sup>
	Ah <sub>2</sub>	30-50	5.2 <sup>c</sup>	0.87 <sup>f</sup>	0.65 <sup>e</sup>	0.18 <sup>c</sup>	17 <sup>b</sup>	89 <sup>c</sup>

598 **Table 8.** Microbial Biomass (MBC  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1}$  soil), fluorescein diacetate (FDA) hydrolysis (fluorescein  
599 released,  $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$  dry soil; acid phosphatase and alkaline phosphatase (Ac and Ak. P.  $\mu\text{g p-nitrophenol}$   
600  $\text{g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ ) and urease (URE  $\mu\text{g NH}_4^+\text{-N g}^{-1}\text{dry soil } 2 \text{ h}^{-1}$ ), Dehydrogenase (DH  $\mu\text{g INTF g}^{-1}$  dry soil  $\text{h}^{-1}$ )  
601  $\beta$ -glucosidase ( $\beta$ -GLU  $\mu\text{g p-nitrophenol g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ ) activities, in forest soil over seasons. Numbers denote  
602 the standard errors (n=18) Means with the same letters are not significantly different (Tukey's test. p  
603  $\leq 0.05$ )

Season	Horizon	Depth cm	FDA	DH	$\beta$ -GLU	URE	Ac.P	Ak.P	MBC
Autumn	Oi	5-0	0.555 <sup>c</sup>	123 <sup>b</sup>	211 <sup>b</sup>	152.3 <sup>a</sup>	1204 <sup>b</sup>	894 <sup>b</sup>	2170 <sup>b</sup>
	Ah <sub>1</sub>	0-30	0.301 <sup>i</sup>	45 <sup>c</sup>	142 <sup>d</sup>	46.7 <sup>c</sup>	513 <sup>c</sup>	212 <sup>d</sup>	1007 <sup>e</sup>
	Ah <sub>2</sub>	30-50	0.121 <sup>l</sup>	17 <sup>d</sup>	49 <sup>f</sup>	34.1 <sup>d</sup>	127 <sup>e</sup>	99 <sup>f</sup>	431 <sup>f</sup>
Winter	Oi	5-0	0.400 <sup>f</sup>	119 <sup>b</sup>	199 <sup>b</sup>	102.7 <sup>b</sup>	1190 <sup>b</sup>	851 <sup>b</sup>	1950 <sup>c</sup>
	Ah <sub>1</sub>	0-30	0.107 <sup>g</sup>	47 <sup>c</sup>	138 <sup>d</sup>	25.6 <sup>e</sup>	497 <sup>c</sup>	201 <sup>d</sup>	999 <sup>e</sup>
	Ah <sub>2</sub>	30-50	0.091 <sup>m</sup>	19 <sup>d</sup>	41 <sup>f</sup>	23.7 <sup>e</sup>	135 <sup>e</sup>	103 <sup>f</sup>	430 <sup>f</sup>
Spring	Oi	5-0	0.899 <sup>a</sup>	199 <sup>a</sup>	333 <sup>a</sup>	156.2 <sup>a</sup>	2771 <sup>a</sup>	2468 <sup>a</sup>	2611 <sup>a</sup>
	Ah <sub>1</sub>	0-30	0.530 <sup>d</sup>	109 <sup>b</sup>	168 <sup>c</sup>	51.3 <sup>c</sup>	914 <sup>b</sup>	397 <sup>c</sup>	1514 <sup>d</sup>
	Ah <sub>2</sub>	30-50	0.358 <sup>g</sup>	44 <sup>c</sup>	69 <sup>e</sup>	26.9 <sup>e</sup>	207 <sup>d</sup>	184 <sup>e</sup>	449 <sup>f</sup>
Summer	Oi	5-0	0.834 <sup>b</sup>	205 <sup>a</sup>	320 <sup>a</sup>	151.6 <sup>a</sup>	2754 <sup>a</sup>	2563 <sup>a</sup>	2573 <sup>a</sup>
	Ah <sub>1</sub>	0-30	0.421 <sup>e</sup>	115 <sup>b</sup>	170 <sup>c</sup>	46.7 <sup>c</sup>	934 <sup>b</sup>	401 <sup>c</sup>	1036 <sup>e</sup>
	Ah <sub>2</sub>	30-50	0.330 <sup>h</sup>	50 <sup>c</sup>	77 <sup>e</sup>	22.1 <sup>c</sup>	199 <sup>d</sup>	170 <sup>e</sup>	439 <sup>f</sup>

605 **Table 9.** Correlation coefficients between SOM and MBC, FDA and WSP indexes in forest and  
606 agriculture soils subjected to different management practices and climate. Case study 1: effects of  
607 artificial brackish water at different concentrations (0; 0.5%; 1%; 1.5%) on agriculture soil. Case  
608 study 2: effects of amendment with digestate at different concentrations (0, 25, 50, 75 %) on  
609 agriculture soil. Case study 3: effects of gap size on forest soil under *Fagus sylvatica* and *Abies*  
610 *Alba*. Case study 4: effects of seasonal variation on forest soil under *Pinus laricio*.

		MBC index	FDA index	WSP index
<i>Case study 1</i>				
	<i>r</i>	-0.936	0.836	0.211
SOM index	<i>p</i> -value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
	R <sup>2</sup>	0.877	0.700	0.044
<i>Case study 2</i>				
	<i>r</i>	-0.635	0.373	0.977
SOM index	<i>p</i> -value	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
	R <sup>2</sup>	0.403	0.139	0.955
<i>Case study 3</i>				
	<i>r</i>	0.518	0.927	-0.677
SOM index	<i>p</i> -value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
	R <sup>2</sup>	0.269	0.860	0.459
<i>Case study 4</i>				
	<i>r</i>	0.545	0.852	-0.184
SOM index	<i>p</i> -value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
	R <sup>2</sup>	0.297	0.725	0.034