

**1Title: Simulation of the impacts of restoration techniques on soil organic
2carbon content and structure in West Africa**

3

4Jérôme T. Yaméogo^a, Sotiria Panakoulia^b, Manolis Kotronakis^b, Irénée Somda^a, Nikolaos P.

5Nikolaidis^b, Anne Mette Lykke^c, Jørgen Aagaard Axelsen^c

6^a*Polytechnic University of Bobo-Dioulasso (UPB) by University of Nazi Boni (UNB), 01*

7*BP1091, Bobo-Dioulasso, Burkina Faso*

8^b*Technical University of Crete (TUC), School of Environmental Engineering, University*

9*Campus, 73100 Chania, Greece*

10^c*Aarhus University, Department of Bioscience, Vejløvej 25, 8660 Silkeborg, Denmark*

11*Corresponding author: Jørgen Axelsen, Aarhus University, Department of Bioscience,*

12*Vejløvej 25, 8660 Silkeborg, Denmark , e-mail: jaa@bios.au.dk*

14Abstract

15The main objective of this study was to evaluate two restoration techniques, “stone rows” and
 16“stone rows + tree planting” on soil organic carbon (SOC) sequestration and structure in terms
 17of water stable aggregates as well as the time required to restore soil fertility. The Carbon,
 18Aggregate and Structure Turnover (CAST) model was used to model the changes of SOC
 19content and water stable aggregate formation under the two restoration techniques. Field
 20experiments used for calibration of the model were conducted using a randomized block
 21design. Soil samples were class fractionated followed by a micro-aggregate isolation
 22procedure. The two restoration techniques contributed significantly to improving soil total
 23carbon content. By running five year simulation of the “stone rows”, the estimated total
 24carbon input was 27 Mg ha⁻¹ of which 6.1 Mg ha⁻¹ were sequestered in the soil and 20.7 Mg ha⁻¹
 25were released as CO₂. In “stone rows + planting”, the total SOC content after five years was
 26estimated to be 22.96 Mg ha⁻¹, which was broken down to 15.43 Mg ha⁻¹ aggregated carbon and
 2726.60 Mg ha⁻¹ CO₂. Fifty-year simulations showed a SOC increase to 54.8 Mg ha⁻¹ in “stone
 28rows”, and to 86.0 Mg ha⁻¹ in “stone rows + planting”. This means that natural grassland
 29vegetation slowly improves soil carbon content and soil quality, but with trees behind stone
 30rows, the result will be about 50% higher.

32**Key words:** water stable aggregates, carbon, restoration, modelling, stone rows, tree planting

351. Introduction

36The causes of land degradation and desertification are both natural and anthropogenic.

37Degradation processes are driven by dry conditions and various human actions resulting in
38depletion of soil and reduced fertility of billions of hectares of range- and cropland throughout
39the world. Almost 40% of the world's agricultural land has been significantly degraded,
40affecting farming and grazing productivity as well as the livelihoods of more than 1 billion
41people in 100 countries (IDRC, 2008).

42Africa is one of the continents facing the most severe consequences of desertification and land
43degradation since two-thirds of its land is already degraded (UNCCD, 2013), affecting 65%
44of the entire African human population. Furthermore, land degradation in Africa is occurring
45despite the efforts frame of the United Nations Convention on Combating Desertification
46(UNCCD) to combat desertification. In Burkina Faso for example, 1,198,000 ha (17.5%) of
47forest were lost between 1990 and 2010 (FAO, 2010) and almost 24% of the soils have turned
48into bare incrustated soils (zipellés) in central and northern Africa (Zougmore et al., 2004).

49The urgency to restore degraded ecosystems in Africa has been recognized by international
50organizations and the scientific community, resulting in the development of various
51restoration techniques (Kagambèga et al., 2011a). Soil treatment and water harvesting
52techniques are often used, such as deep ploughing, creation of half-moon micro-catchments,
53or building up simple stone rows (Zougmore et al., 2003). These techniques have been shown
54to be effective in decreasing surface runoff, controlling erosion and improving soil fertility
55and revegetation of degraded landscapes (Kagambèga et al., 2011b; Yaméogo et al., 2011).
56Enhancement of natural regeneration processes is attained by simply protecting land (ITTO,
572002) and tree planting has been used to accelerate natural regeneration processes.

58 Soil fertility is related to carbon and water stable aggregate contents (Six *et al.*, 2000; Paul *et al.*, 2013). Most work on water stable aggregates and soil fertility has been carried out for 59 agricultural soils (e.g. Six *et al.*, 2000; Boogar *et al.*, 2014). Afforestation has been shown to 60 increase soil organic carbon (SOC) content (Gong *et al.*, 2013), however, the impacts on soil 61 structure and water stable aggregates are not well known. There has been increased interest in 62 the scientific literature regarding the restoration of degraded agricultural soils using carbon 63 amendments and agro-ecological practices such as conservation tillage (Mrabet, 2002; 64 Kösters *et al.*, 2013).

66 Giannakis *et al.* (2014) used the CAST model to simulate the impact of carbon amendments 67 in agricultural soils on water stable aggregate distribution and carbon sequestration. The 68 CAST model (Stamati *et al.*, 2013) is based on the concept soil aggregation and 69 disaggregation where macro-aggregates are formed around silt-clay particles, micro- 70 aggregates and particulate organic matter. The CAST model can identify the factors affecting 71 carbon sequestration and turnover in soils and ascertain the response of soil to land use and 72 climate change as well as agro-ecological practices (Li *et al.*, 2016; Apostolakis *et al.*, 2017). 73 The overall objective was to assess the impact of two soil restoration techniques, “stone rows 74 (SR)” and “stone rows + tree planting (SRP)” on carbon sequestration and soil structure and 75 to assess the time required to restore fertility using the CAST model.

76 2. Material and methods

77 2.1 Study area

78 The experiment was conducted on an endo-petric skeletal lixisol in the rural township of Dissin 79 near the Total and Partial Reserves of Fauna of Bontioli, south-western part of Burkina Faso 80 between the latitudes of 05°01'W and 4°26'W and longitudes of 12°01'N and 12°23'N. The

81climate is south-sudanian with the wet season in the summer-fall and the dry in winter-spring.
82The average annual rainfall is 1000 mm (1997 to 2007) and fluctuated between 900 mm and
831200 mm. The annual mean temperature is 29°C (Kaboré et al., 2015). Extensive grazing and
84agriculture without fallow periods are the prevailing land uses, causing degradation of soil
85and vegetation cover.

862.2 Experimental setup

87The experiment included two treatments and a control situated on fallow land on a slight
88slope (randomized block design with three replicates each). It was assumed that the control
89plots represented background soils and the data collected from these plots were used as a
90base-line for the evaluation of the impact of the restoration measures. The data from the
91control plots could therefore be used as initial conditions in the model regarding SOC content
92in order to assess the efficacy of restoration. The two treatments were stone rows (Figure 1)
93with natural vegetation (SR) and stone rows with densely planted of seedlings of the native
94tree *Piliostigma thonningii* (SRP). The planting density was about 5000 plants/ha. The
95dimensions of each plot were 20 m x 35 m (700 m²) and the stone rows were situated on the
96downhill side of the slight slope of the plots. The slope fluctuated between 2 to 3%. The
97blocks were separated by 15 m while the plots within a block were separated by 5 m. The
98entire research site was protected from animals through fencing. The tree species *P.*
99*thonningii* was chosen because it is a pioneer species of fallow land colonization in Burkina
100Faso. The rural population is using it mainly for medicinal purposes. Its wood is also used as
101firewood and for house construction. The experiment started in May 2011.

1022.3 Soil sampling and analysis

103Soil samples were collected in May 2011 to determine the initial conditions. Soil samples for
104the modelling the impact of the two treatments were collected in October 2014. One

105 composite sample from 0-15 cm depth was constituted with the soil taken on the uphill side,
106 downhill side and the middle of each plot. The pipette method was used to determine soil
107 texture (Loveland and Whalley, 1991). The pH was measured in a 1:2.5 soil/water suspension
108 described by Sahilemedhin and Taye (2000). The Kjeldahl method (NKT) was used to
109 analyse total nitrogen (Bremner, 1965) and the Bray1 method for total available phosphorus
110 (van Reeuwijk, 2002). Potassium was extracted with ammonium acetate-extractable cations
111 and analysed by atomic absorption spectrometry.

112 Wet-sieving was used to determine the content and size distribution of water stable aggregates
113 followed by sand correction (subtracting the sand particles of given size class) according to
114 the fractionation procedure described by Stamati (2012). The size class fractionation was
115 followed by micro-aggregate isolation described by Lichter *et al.* (2008). The procedure is
116 summarized in Figure 2. Finally, the carbon content of water stable aggregate size classes and
117 bulk soil was analysed by the Walkley-Black method (Mylavarapu, 2015).

118 **2.4 Data analysis**

119 The normality of the data was verified using the Shapiro–Wilk test at alpha-level 0.05. An
120 analysis of variance was conducted using the XLSTAT 7.5 software. The null hypothesis of
121 the equality of the means was tested using the Newman-Keuls test at the 95% significance
122 level.

123 **2.5 Simulation of the restoration process**

124 **2.5.1 The CAST model**

125 The CAST models (Stamati *et al.*, 2013) simulate the evolution of aggregation and
126 disaggregation processes using three particle size classes: the silt-clay ($AC1 < 53 \mu m$), micro-
127 aggregates ($AC2, 53-250 \mu m$) and macro-aggregates ($AC3, > 250 \mu m$). The aggregation

process is initiated when soil plant residue is colonized by microbes. These decomposers exude the binding material for soil particles, bacteria and fungi to form macro-aggregates around Particulate Organic Matter (POM). Further decomposition of macro-aggregate POM is encrusted within silt-clay aggregates, forming in these way micro-aggregates within macro-aggregates (AC2 and AC3). Biodegradation of macro-aggregate incorporated organic matter (OM) reduces their stability and increases the export of microbial biopolymers. Under slaking events, these macro-aggregates break down and release micro-aggregates, silt–clay aggregates and POM. The aggregation and dis-aggregation cycle starts again when new plant residues enters the soil. The CAST model uses the RothC carbon pools (Coleman and Jenkinson, 1999): Decomposable Plant Material (DPM), Resistant Plant Material (RPM), Microbial Biomass (BIO), Humified Organic Matter (HUM) and Inert Organic Matter (IOM). The AC1 aggregate type is consisting of BIO, HUM and IOM. The AC2 aggregate type is consisting of BIO, HUM, IOM and fine DPM and RPM pools. The AC3 aggregate type is consisting of BIO, HUM, IOM and fine and coarse deriving DPM and RPM pools. Each carbon pool decomposes into CO₂, BIO and HUM with a first-order process. The inert matter pool represents is recalcitrant and similar to biochar. The clay content of the soil determines the breakdown of organic matter into CO₂, BIO and HUM (Coleman and Jenkinson, 1999). The CAST model also simulates the changes in bulk density and porosity. Table 1 summarizes the abbreviations reported in this manuscript.

Table 1

2.5.2 Simulations

The model set up required inputs of climatic conditions (temperature, precipitation, evapotranspiration), above ground plant derived C (litterfall) and soil properties such as bulk density, soil depth, and particle size distribution. Moreover, data of the initial conditions were

used by the model, such as the water stable aggregate distribution in the three classes (AC1, AC2 and AC3) and their respective SOC content. After a three-year application of the two restoration techniques, soil samples were analysed for SOC and water stable aggregates from both plots. These data were used for the model calibration through the calibration of carbon decomposition rates, the macro- and micro- aggregate formation and the fragmentation rate of the fresh plant material. Five-year simulations for the two techniques were used to describe the impact of the SR and SRP. Since the CAST model successfully described the carbon and aggregate dynamics of the experiment, a 50-year scenario was conducted with the calibrated model, in order to reach steady state conditions and assess the long-term impact of the two restoration techniques on the degraded soil.

Results

3.1 Soil analyses

3.1.1 Initial soil physical and chemical characterization

The initial physical (Table 2) and chemical (Table 3) soil parameters did not show significant differences, both treatments and control contained about 70% sand and 30% finer particles (silt and clay), pH was slightly acidic (5.50-5.54) and total nitrogen (0.04%) and organic matter (0.9%) were low.

Table 2

Table 3

3.1.2 Development of water stable aggregates

The large macro-aggregates (LAC3), the medium macro-aggregates (MAC3), the small macro-aggregates (SAC3) and the micro-aggregates (AC2), showed no significant differences between the treatments (Figure 3). The silt-clay sized micro-aggregates (AC1) showed a

175significant difference ($p < 0.001$) between treatments. Thus, SRP increased this fraction by
17647% and 63%, respectively, in relation to the control.

1773.1.3 Development of carbon content in aggregate size classes

178The carbon content in the SRP treatment was significantly higher than the control in small
179macro-aggregates (SAC3), micro-aggregates (AC2) and silt-clay size classes (AC1), while SR
180showed significant increases compared to the control in the silt-clay size class only (AC1)
181(Figure 4). There were no significant differences between the treatments in the large (LAC3)
182and medium sized aggregates (MAC3).

1833.2 Simulations

1843.2.1 Water stable aggregate distribution and soil carbon in the stone rows treatment

185The CAST model was initialized using the carbon content measured in the control plots and
186calibrated using the measured data from the SR treatment (the crosses on Figure 5) obtained
187after three years of treatment. At the calibration time (36 months) the SOC in the control was
1886.5 Mg ha⁻¹ and it was split between 3.9 Mg ha⁻¹ as POM and 2.6 Mg ha⁻¹ in the silt-clay
189fraction. At the same time (after 36 months), SOC in the SR treatment was calibrated to be
19010.5 Mg ha⁻¹ (Figure 5), and it was split between 5.2 Mg ha⁻¹ as POM and 5.3 Mg ha⁻¹ in the silt-
191clay fraction.

192The whole simulation was extended to five years in order to evaluate the impact of the SR
193treatments on soil restoration in terms of carbon sequestered in the different aggregate size
194classes over a longer period than the experimental three years. The model results over the
195five-year simulation showed a continued increase in carbon content of AC1 to 5.5 Mg ha⁻¹ and
196a total content of 12.6 Mg ha⁻¹ while the carbon content of AC2 and AC3 levelled off after a
197slight increase the first two to three years (Fig 5). During the five year simulation, the

198estimated total carbon input to the SR treatment was 27 Mg ha⁻¹ of which 6.1 Mg ha⁻¹ were
199sequestered in the soil and 21 Mg ha⁻¹ were released as CO₂ (Table 4).

200# Table 4

201

202**3.2.2 Water stable aggregate distribution and soil carbon in the stone rows + planting** 203**treatment**

204The CAST-model was calibrated to simulate the impact of soil restoration of the SRP
205treatment after three years (36 months), and SOC in the SRP treatment was 14.5 Mg ha⁻¹
206(Figure 6), and it was split between 5.6 Mg ha⁻¹ as POM and 8.9 Mg ha⁻¹ in the silt-clay
207fraction. The following five-year simulations show that SOC content can be expected to
208increase to 20.8 Mg ha⁻¹ (Figure 6). The total organic carbon input was 41.1 Mg ha⁻¹ over the
209five years where 14.2 Mg ha⁻¹ were stored in the soil and 26.6 Mg ha⁻¹ were released as CO₂
210(Table 4). This means that tree planting can increase the annual carbon input to the system by
21114.1 Mg ha⁻¹ (52% more than the stone rows) (Table 4) causing an increase of carbon
212sequestration in the soil of 8.1 Mg ha⁻¹ (132% compared to stone rows) as well as an increase
213of 6 Mg ha⁻¹ (29% extra) in CO₂ emission. While the increase in POM between the SR and
214SRP treatments remained about the same, the increase of silt-clay total carbon was 3 times
215larger in the SRP treatment compared to SR.

216The SOC in the CAST model is the sum of the aggregated carbon in AC1, AC2 and AC3 as
217well as the particulate plant derived organic carbon, which is the sum of DPMc, RPMc and
218RPMf. The total SOC content after five years was estimated to be 22.96 Mg ha⁻¹ (Figure 6),
219which was broken down to 15.43 Mg ha⁻¹ aggregated carbon and 7.53 Mg ha⁻¹ plant derived
220organic matter (POM). This means that about 1/3 of the total carbon input to the system has

not undergone fragmentation and thus it was unavailable for sequestration. It is evident that organic degradation processes are not being favoured under the climatic conditions in Burkina Faso. Even though the area receives significant rainfall (1000 mm/yr), the soil is very sandy and well drained, conditions not favourable to retaining soil moisture. Furthermore, the rainy season is only about four months long, which leaves the soil very dry for about eight months.

226

3.2.4 Fifty-year simulations of the development in soil carbon content

Fifty-year simulation of the two systems show that the total accumulation of SOC after 50 years was 54.8 Mg ha⁻¹ for the SR treatment (Figure 7). Of these BIO and HUM comprised 88.1% (BIO = 15.3 Mg ha⁻¹ and HUM = 33.0 Mg ha⁻¹) and the aggregated and un-aggregated POM the remaining (POM-ag = 4.3 Mg ha⁻¹ and POM-un-ag = 2.2 Mg ha⁻¹). The simulation shows a continuous accumulation for BIO, HUM and SOC while the POM components reach steady state after 4 years for the aggregated POM and after 12 yrs for the un-aggregated. Similarly, for the SRT treatment the total accumulation of SOC after 50 years was simulated to be 86 Mg ha⁻¹. BIO and HUM comprised 87% of SOC (BIO = 23.5 Mg ha⁻¹ and HUM = 51.0 Mg ha⁻¹) while the aggregated and un-aggregated POM the remaining (POM-ag = 5.0 Mg ha⁻¹ and POM-un-ag = 6.4 Mg ha⁻¹). The simulations also shows a continuous accumulation for BIO, HUM and SOC while the POM components reach steady state after 4 years of treatment for the aggregated POM and 20 yrs. for the un-aggregated. These simulations highlight the importance of processes and differences between the two treatments. Both treatment favour HUM accumulation over BIO. It should also be noted, that both aggregated and un-aggregated POM reach steady state in both treatments even though the time to steady state

differs between treatments. For both treatments, about 82-83% of the input was converted to $^{14}\text{CO}_2$.

245

2464 Discussion

There was a clear difference in the total soil carbon content in the three plots, showing lowest content in the control, medium content behind the stone rows, and highest content behind the stone rows with planting of *P. thonningii* (Figure 3). The vegetation having better humidity conditions behind the stone row is without doubt the main cause of this difference. In the SR treatment, there was a strong colonization of the space by herbaceous species, and in the SRP treatment in addition to the herbaceous cover, there were the leaves and root turnover of *P. thonningii* trees. These results are consistent with those of Diedhou et al. (2009) and those of Yélémou et al. (2013) who noticed increased carbon and nitrogen content under *P. thonningii* in the semi-arid zone of Senegal and in Burkina Faso, respectively. They explained this increase by increased litter and root biomass. Similarly, Jandl et al. (2007) and Li et al. (2016) reported that afforestation is a major contributor to carbon sequestration in arid areas. The large impact of trees can be explained by Iyamuremye et al. (2000), who reported that the content of nitrogen and hemicelluloses in the leaves of *P. Piliostigma* is high while lignin is low compared to other trees in Senegal. This chemical composition of the leaves makes them difficult to decompose which could explain the higher carbon content and high POM stocks in *P. Piliostigma* plots.

The observed silt-clay fraction carbon content was higher compared to other fractions in all treatments. The SOM of this fraction is strongly associated with the mineral particles and may be physically protected against biodegradation (Plante et al., 2006; Traoré et al. 2015). According to Six et al. (2002) and Traoré et al. (2007), the labile carbon was part of the

267macro-aggregates that provide minimal physical protection since they are composed by plant
268residues. This fraction is sensitive to agricultural practices and affected by land degradation
269processes (Wei et *al.*, 2013).

270The initial carbon content at the restoration site was very low but simulations suggest that it
271can be increased twofold in five years without doing more than establishing low stone rows
272and keeping it free of grazing. If, on top of establishing the stone rows, it is also possible to
273plant trees it is possible to double the restoration speed. The results of this study are very
274encouraging, making it attractive to restore degraded soils by establishing stone rows and
275planting a high density of tree seedlings. Therefore, soil restoration using stone rows and tree
276planting is an applicable method.

277The turnover time of the various carbon fractions calibrated in the CAST model showed that
278the carbon turnover is significantly larger for most of the parameters in the African soils
279compared to the natural restoration processes in Greece and the USA (Stamati et *al.*, 2013).
280This suggests that even though the African soils can accumulate carbon in a short period, the
281organic matter cannot be decomposed fast enough in order to produce humus that will
282increase soil fertility. A possible explanation for the reduced fragmentation and humification
283rates between the different soils is related to soil composition and climate. For instance, even
284though the annual precipitation of Burkina Faso is about 1000 mm, which is higher than the
285ones in Greece and USA, it falls within a short period and there is a 7-8 month period of dry
286season. The combination of long dry season and the fact that the soils of Burkina Faso are
287very sandy (78% to 88% sand), which means that they drain freely and do not have a
288sufficient water holding capacity, results in reduced SOM fragmentation. This is in line with
289the results of Davidson and Janssens (2006) and Wei et *al.* (2013).

290

2915 Conclusion

292This work is to our knowledge the first study, which simulated the evolution of carbon in soils
293during soil restoration in Western Africa. The empiric results showed that SR and SRP
294contributed to improve soil carbon content and simulations suggest that the carbon content
295can be increased two-fold in five years only by establishing a low stone row and keeping it
296free of grazing for five years. With additional planting of trees, it is possible almost to double
297the pace of restoration of degraded soils in Burkina Faso.

298The results from field measurements and the CAST modelling show that SR, and especially
299SRP, can be used as a means of soil restoration.

300

301**Acknowledgments**

302We would like to acknowledge the financial support European Union FP7 project no. 243906
303(“Understanding and combating desertification to mitigate its impact on ecosystem services-
304UNDESERT”). Co-authors Panakoulia, Kotronakis and Nikolaidis would like to acknowledge
305funding provided by the EU FP7-ENV-2009 Project SoilTrEC “Soil Transformations in
306European Catchments” (Grant#244118).

307

308**References**

309Apostolakis, A., Panakoulia, S., Nikolaidis, N. P., & Paranychianakis, N. V., 2017. Shifts in
310soil structure and soil organic matter in a chronosequence of set-aside fields. *Soil Till. Res.*
311174, 113-119. [DOI: 10.1016/j.still.2017.07.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2017.07.004)

312Boogar, A. M., Jahansouz, M. R., & Mehravar, M. R., 2014. Soil aggregate size distribution
 313and stability following Conventional-till, Minimum-till and No-till systems. *Intl. J. Farm. &*
 314*Alli. Sci.* 3, 512-517.

315Bremner, J. M., 1965. Total nitrogen. Part 2: Chemical and Microbiological Properties, in:
 316Black, C. A. (Ed.), *Methods of Soil Analysis*. American Society of Agronomy, Inc., Madison
 317WI, pp. 1149-1178.

318Coleman, K., & Jenkinson, D. S., 1999. RothC-26.3 – A Model for the turnover of carbon in
 319soil: Model description and windows users guide. Accessed 21 Oct 2020 from
 320www.rothamsted.ac.uk/sites/default/files/RothC_guide_WIN.pdf

321Davidson, E. A., & Janssens, I. A., 2006. Temperature sensitivity of soil carbon
 322decomposition and feedbacks to climate change. *Nature* 400, 165-173.
 323DOI: 10.1038/nature04514

324Diedhou, S., Dossa, E. L., Badiane, A. N., Diedhou, I., Séné, M., & Dick, R. P., 2009.
 325Decomposition and spatial microbial heterogeneity associated with native shrubs in soils of
 326agroecosystems in semi-arid Senegal. *Pedobiologia* 52, 273-286.
 327DOI: 10.1016/j.pedobi.2008.11.002

328FAO, 2010. Evaluation des ressources forestières mondiales. FAO, Rome. Giannakis, G. V.,
 329Panakoulia, S. K., Nikolaidis, N. P., & Paranychianakis, N. V., 2014. Simulating soil fertility
 330restoration using the CAST model. *Procedia Earth Planet. Sci.* 10, 325-329.
 331DOI: 10.1016/j.proeps.2014.08.027

332Gong, X., Liu, Y., Wei, X., Guo, X., Niu, D., Zhang, W., Zhang, J., & Zhang, L., 2013. Sub-
 333trophic degraded red soil restoration: is soil organic carbon build-up limited by nutrients
 334supply. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 300, 77-87. DOI: 10.1016/j.foreco.2012.12.002

335 IDRC (International Development Research Centre) 2008. *Special Examination Report*.

336 Annual Report 2007–2008, Canada. Accessed 20 October 2020 from

337 [www.idrc.ca/sites/default/files/sp/Documents%20EN/about/idrc-special-examination-report-](http://www.idrc.ca/sites/default/files/sp/Documents%20EN/about/idrc-special-examination-report-3382008.pdf)

338 2008.pdf

339 [ITTO \(International Tropical Timber Organization\), 2002. ITTO guidelines for the](#)

340 [restoration, management and rehabilitation of degraded and secondary tropical forests. ITTO,](#)

341 [Berne, Switzerland](#). Accessed 20 October 2020 from: [www.iucn.org/content/itto-guidelines-](http://www.iucn.org/content/itto-guidelines-342restoration-management-and-rehabilitation-degraded-and-secondary-tropical-forests)

342 restoration-management-and-rehabilitation-degraded-and-secondary-tropical-forests

343 Iyamuremye, F., Gewin, V., Dick, R. P., Diack, M., Sené, M., Badiane, A., & Diatta, M.,

344 2000. Carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus mineralization potential of native agroforestry plant

345 residues in soils of Senegal. *Arid Soil Res. Rehabil.* 14, 359-371.

346 DOI: 10.1080/08903060050136469

347 Jandl, R., Lindner, M., Vesterdal, L., Bauwens, B., Baritz R., Hagedorn, F., Johnson, D. W.,

348 Minkinen, K., & Byrne, K. A., 2007. How strongly can forest management influence soil

349 carbon sequestration? *Geoderma* 137, 253-268. DOI: 10.1016/j.geoderma.2006.09.003

350 Kaboré, S. A., Schumann, K., Hien, M., Lykke, A. M., Hahn, K., & Nacro, H. B., 2015.

351 Stratégies d'adaptation à la réduction des services écosystémiques: cas des potentialités de

352 substitution de trois espèces forestières dans le Sud-Ouest du Burkina Faso. *Int. J. Biol.*

353 *Chem. Sci.* 9, 1194-1208. DOI: 10.4314/ijbcs.v9i3.5

354 Kagambèga, F. W., Traoré, S., Thiombiano, T., & Boussim, J. I., 2011a. Impact de trois

355 techniques de restauration des sols sur la survie et la croissance de trois espèces ligneuses sur

356 les 'zipellés' au Burkina Faso. *Int. J. Biol. Chem. Sci.* 5, 901-914. DOI:

357 10.4314/ijbcs.v5i3.72174

358Kagamèbga W. F., Thiombiano A., Traoré S., Zougmore R., & Boussim, J. I., 2011b.

359Survival and growth responses of *Jatropha curcas* L. to three restoration techniques on

360degraded soils in Burkina Faso. *Ann. For. Res.* 54, 171-184. Accessed 20 October 2020 from:

361[www.researchgate.net/publication/265283875_Survival_and_growth_responses_of_Jatropha](http://www.researchgate.net/publication/265283875_Survival_and_growth_responses_of_Jatropha_curcas_L_to_three_restoration_techniques_on_degraded_soils_in_Burkina_Faso)

362[curcas_L_to_three_restoration_techniques_on_degraded_soils_in_Burkina_Faso](http://www.researchgate.net/publication/265283875_Survival_and_growth_responses_of_Jatropha_curcas_L_to_three_restoration_techniques_on_degraded_soils_in_Burkina_Faso)

363Kösters, R., Preger, A. C., Du Preez, C., & Amelung, W., 2013. Re-aggregation dynamics of

364degraded cropland soils with prolonged secondary pasture management in the South African

365Highveld. *Geoderma* 192, 173-181. DOI: 10.1016/j.geoderma.2012.07.011

366Li, X. J., Li, X. R., Wang, X. P., & Yang, H. T., 2016. Changes in soil organic carbon

367fractions after afforestation with xerophytic shrubs in the Tengger Desert, northern China.

368*Eur. J. Soil Sci.* 67, 184-195. DOI: 10.1111/ejss.12315

369Lichter, K., Govaerts, B., Six, J., Sayre, K. D., Deckers, J., & Dendooven, L., 2008.

370Aggregation and C and N contents of soil organic matter fractions in a permanent raised-bed

371planting system in the highlands of Central Mexico. *Plant Soil* 305, 237-252.

372DOI: 10.1007/s11104-008-9557-9

373Loveland, P. J., & Whalley, W. R., 1991. *Particle Size Analysis*, in: Smith, K.A. and Mullis,

374C.E. (eds), *Soil Analysis: Physical Methods*. Marcel Dekker Inc., New York. pp. 271-328.

375Mrabet, R., 2002. Stratification of soil aggregation and organic matter under conservation

376tillage systems in Africa. *Soil Till. Res.* 66, 119-128. DOI: 10.1016/S0167-1987(02)00020-X

377Mylavarapu, R., 2015. *Walkley-Black Method*. Accessed 20 October 2020 from:

378[www.academia.edu/28267631/Walkley_Black_Method_Soil_Organic_Matter_Application_a](http://www.academia.edu/28267631/Walkley_Black_Method_Soil_Organic_Matter_Application_and_Principle)

379[nd_Principle](http://www.academia.edu/28267631/Walkley_Black_Method_Soil_Organic_Matter_Application_and_Principle)

380Paul, B. K., Vanlauwe, B., Ayuke, F., Gassner, A., Hoogmoed M., Hurisso, T. T., Koala S.,
381Lelei, D., Ndabamenyea, T., Six, J., & Pullema, M. M., 2013. Medium-term impact of tillage
382and residue management on soil aggregate stability, soil carbon and crop productivity. *Agric.*
383*Ecosyst. Environ.* [164](#), 14-22. DOI: 10.1016/j.agee.2012.10.003

384Plante, A. F., Conant, R. T., Stewart, C. E., Paustian, K., & Six, J., 2006. Impact of soil
385texture on the distribution of soil organic matter in physical and chemical fractions. *Soil Sci.*
386*Soc. Am. J.* 70, 287-296. DOI: 10.2136/sssaj2004.0363

387Sahilemedhin, S. & Taye, B., 2000. “*Procedures for Soil and Plant Analysis*”, National Soil
388Research Center, Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organization. Technical paper 74. Addis
389Ababa, Ethiopia.

390Six, J., Paustian, K., Elliott, E. T., & Combrink, C., 2000. Soil structure and organic matter: I.
391Distribution of aggregate-size classes and aggregate-associated carbon. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*
39264, 681-689. DOI: 10.2136/sssaj2000.642681x

393Six, J., Conant, R. T., Paul, E. A., & Paustian, K., 2002. Stabilization mechanisms of soil
394organic matter: implications for C-saturation of soils. *Plant Soil* 241, 155–176. DOI: 10.1023/
395A:1016125726789

396Stamati, F.E., 2012. *Carbon and nitrogen cycling in agricultural lands*, PhD thesis, Technical
397University of Crete, Chania.

398Stamati, F. E., Nikolaidis, N. P., Banwart, S., & Blum, W. E. H., 2013. A coupled carbon,
399aggregation, and structure turnover (CAST) model for topsoils. *Geoderma* 211-212, 51-64.
400DOI: 10.1016/j.geoderma.2013.06.014

401Traoré, S., Thiombiano, L., Millogo, J.R., & Guinko, S., 2007. Carbon and nitrogen
402enhancement in Cambisols and Vertisols by *Acacia* spp. in eastern Burkina Faso: Relation to

403soil respiration and microbial biomass. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* 35, 660-669.

404DOI: 10.1016/j.apsoil.2006.09.004

405Traoré, S., Ouattara, K., Ilstedt, U., Schmidt, M., Thiombiano, A., Malmer, A., & Nyberg, G.,
4062015. Effect of land degradation on carbon and nitrogen pools in two soil types of a semi-arid
407landscape in West Africa. *Geoderma*, 241-242, 330-338.

408DOI: 10.1016/j.geoderma.2014.11.027

409UNCCD, 2013. *Background Document: The Economics of Desertification, Land Degradation*
410*and Drought: Methodologies and Analysis for Decision-Making*. Bonn, Germany, United
411Nations Convention to Combat Desertification.

412van Reeuwijk, L.P., 2002. *Procedures for soil analysis. Sixth edition Technical Report 9*.

413ISRIC-World Soil Information, Wageningen, Netherlands, FOA.

414Wei, X., Shao, M., Gale, W. J., Zhang, X., & Li, L., 2013. Dynamics of aggregate-associated
415organic carbon following conversion of forest to cropland. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 57, 876-883.

416DOI: 10.1016/j.soilbio.2012.10.020

417Yaméogo, J. T., Hien, M., Lykke, A. M., Somé, A. N., & Thiombiano, A., 2011. Effet des
418techniques de conservation des eaux et des sols, zaï forestier et cordons pierreux, sur la
419réhabilitation de la végétation herbacée à l'Ouest du Burkina Faso. *Int. J. Biol. Chem. Sci.* 5,
42056-71. DOI: [10.4314/ijbcs.v5i1.68085](https://doi.org/10.4314/ijbcs.v5i1.68085)

421Yélémou, B., Dayamba, S. D., Bambara, D., Yaméogo, G., & Assimi, S., 2013. Soil carbon
422and nitrogen dynamics linked to *Piliostigma* species in ferugino-tropical soils in the Sudano-
423Sahelian zone of Burkina Faso, West Africa. *J. For. Res.* 24, 99-108. DOI: 10.1007/s11676-
424013-0329-x

425Zougmore, R., Mando, A., Ringersma, J., & Stroosnijder, L., 2003. Effect of combined water
426and nutrient management on runoff and sorghum yield in semiarid Burkina Faso. *Soil Use*
427*Manage.* 19, 257-264. DOI: 10.1079/SUM2003199

428Zougmore R., Mando A., & Stroosnijder L., 2004. Effect of soil and water conservation and
429nutrient management on the soil-plant water balance in semi-arid Burkina Faso. *Agric. Water*
430*Manage.* 65, 103-120. DOI: 10.1016/j.agwat.2003.07.001

431Table 1. Summary of the abbreviations used in the text.

Abbreviation	Definition
AC1	Silt-clay sized aggregates (< 53 µm)
AC2	microaggregates (53-250 µm)
AC3	macroaggregates (> 250 µm)
LAC3	Large macroaggregates (> 2000 µm)
MAC3	Medium macroaggregates (1000–2000 µm)
SAC3	Small macroaggregates (250–1000 µm)
mM	Microaggregates with macroaggregates
Sc-M	Easily dispersed silt-clay fraction
BIO	microbial Biomass
CAST	Carbon Aggregation and Structure Turnover model
DPM	Decomposable Plant Material
DPMc	coarse Decomposable Plant Material
HUM	Humified Organic Matter
IOM	Inert Organic Matter
POM	Particulate Organic Matter
cPOM	Coarse Particulate Organic Matter
fPOM	Fine Particulate Organic Matter
RPM	Resistant Plant Material
RPMf	fine Resistant Plant Material
RPMc	coarse Resistant Plant Material
SOC	Soil Organic Carbon
SOM	Soil Organic Matter
SR	Stone Rows
SRP	Stone Rows + tree Planting

432

433**Table 2:** Initial soil texture in the experimental plots (3 replicates).

Treatments	Clay (%)	Silt (%)	Sand (%)
tone rows	10.08	19.14	70.77
Stone rows+ planting	9.59	20.16	70.24
Control	9.92	20.60	69.48
<i>F statistic</i>	<i>0.16</i>	<i>0.99</i>	<i>0.52</i>
<i>P-value</i>	<i>0.86</i>	<i>0.43</i>	<i>0.62</i>

435**Table 3.** Initial soil chemical characteristics in the experimental plots (3 replicates).

Treatments	pH	Organic matter (%)	Extractable phosphorus (mg/kg)	Available K(meq/100g)	Total N (%)	C/N
Stone rows	5.52	0.90	1.12	36.88	0.04	12.21
Stone rows + planting	5.54	0.92	1.08	31.56	0.04	12.39
Control	5.50	0.86	1.02	32.95	0.04	12.74
<i>F statistic</i>	<i>0.02</i>	<i>0.09</i>	<i>0.23</i>	<i>0.64</i>	<i>0.36</i>	<i>0.08</i>
<i>P-value</i>	<i>0.986</i>	<i>0.917</i>	<i>0.805</i>	<i>0.558</i>	<i>0.715</i>	<i>0.9207</i>

436

437**Table 4.** Carbon fluxes (Mg ha⁻¹) in the two treatments over five years.

Treatment	Input (total)	SOC initial	SOC final (after 5 y)	Storage	CO₂ emissions
Stone rows	27.0	6.51	12.65	6.14	20.70
Stone rows + planting	41.1	6.51	22.96	15.43	26.60

438SOC = Soil organic carbon

439

440