

1

1 **The fate of seeds in the soil: a review of the influence of overland flow on seed removal and**
2 **its consequences for the vegetation of arid and semiarid patchy ecosystems.**

3 E. Bochet¹

4 ¹ Centro de Investigaciones sobre Desertificación – CIDE (CSIC, UV, GV). Carretera de
5 Moncada a Náquera km 4.5, 46113 Moncada (Valencia), Spain.

6 Corresponding author: esther.bochet@uv.es

7

8

9 **Abstract**

10 Since seeds are the principle means by which plants move across the landscapes, the final fate
11 of seeds plays a fundamental role in the assemblage, functioning and dynamics of plant
12 communities. Once seeds land on the soil surface after being dispersed from the parent plant,
13 they can be moved horizontally by surface runoff. In arid and semiarid patchy ecosystems,
14 where seeds are scattered into a very heterogeneous environment and intense rainfalls occur, the
15 transport of seeds by runoff to new sites may be an opportunity for seeds to reach more
16 favourable sites for seed germination and seedling survival. Although seed transport by runoff
17 may be of vital importance for the recruitment of plants in these ecosystems, it has received
18 little attention in the scientific literature, especially among soil scientists. The main goals are (1)
19 to offer an updated conceptual model of seed fate with a special attention to seed destiny in and
20 on the soil, (2) to review studies on seed fate in overland flow and the ecological implications
21 seed transport by runoff has for the origin, spatial patterning and maintenance of patches in arid
22 and semiarid patchy ecosystems, and finally (3) to point out directions for future research.

23 Our review shows that seed fate in overland flow may result either in the export of seeds from
24 the system (seed loss) or in the spatial redistribution of seeds within the system through short-
25 distance seed movements (seed displacement). Seed transport by runoff depends on rainfall,
26 slope and soil characteristics. ~~Seed susceptibility to be removed~~ varies highly between species
27 and is mainly related to seed traits, ~~as~~ seed size, seed shape, presence of appendages, and seed
28 ability to secrete mucilage. Although initially considered as a risk of seed loss, seed removal by
29 runoff has recently been described as an ecological driver that shapes plant composition from
30 the first phases of ~~the~~ plant life, by favouring species with seeds able to resist erosion and by
31 selecting for plant traits that prevent seed loss. Moreover, the interaction of seed transport by
32 overland flow with the high seed trapping capacity of vegetated patches results in a “patch-to-
33 patch” transport of seeds that plays a relevant role in vegetation establishment and patterning in
34 arid and semiarid patchy ecosystems.

35 Overall, this review shows how the knowledge about seed fate in overland flow can be used to
36 explain a number of important characteristics of whole plant communities. It also underlines
37 important gaps of knowledge that should be filled in. Future lines of **research** are proposed in
38 order to broaden our understanding of the origin, maintenance and dynamics of patchiness in
39 arid and semiarid ecosystems and to improve restoration success of intensively eroded
40 ecosystems.

41

42 **Key-words:** runoff, erosion, slope, seed transport, secondary dispersal, seed traits, mucilage,
43 ecological driver, spatial pattern, ecohydrology, ecogeomorphology, drylands

44 1. Introduction

45 The term “seed fate” has been ~~usually~~ used to describe what happens to seeds from the moment
46 they are produced by mother plants until they become seedlings. In the 1970s and 1980s, seed
47 dispersal was described as a simple and direct process of seed movement from the mother plant
48 to the final microsite where the seed germinates or dies. Seed dispersal was accomplished by
49 different biotic ~~or~~ abiotic agents (wind, animals, gravity,~~---~~) and its outcome was considered
50 stochastic. The possibility of further seed dispersal after seeds reached their first landing surface
51 was not taken into account (Vander Wall et al., 2002; Forget and Wenny, 2002). The lack of
52 empirical studies on the ultimate stages of dispersal –due to the difficulty of measuring seed
53 dispersal (Bullock et al., 2006)- led to incomplete information about the pathways seeds might
54 follow until they germinate (Vander Wall et al., 2002). However, in the early 1990s, the
55 development of a variety of new techniques that permitted to follow seeds in space and time
56 (metal detectors, fluorescent dyes, genetic tools,~~---~~) provided evidence that seed dispersal was a
57 far more dynamic and complex process than ~~it~~ was previously portrayed (Forget and Milleron,
58 1991; Chambers and Mac Mahon, 1994; Böhning-Gaese et al., 1999). It became evident that
59 seed fate involved multiple steps and agents and its outcome was non-hazardous. Thus, after the
60 initial movement of seeds from the mother plant to the first landing site (“primary” dispersal), a
61 second dispersal stage started to be considered consisting ~~in~~ any significant subsequent vertical
62 or horizontal seed movement from this first site ~~on~~ (“secondary” dispersal, Chambers and Mac
63 Mahon, 1994; Böhning-Gaese et al., 1999). A variety of biotic and abiotic agents, including
64 overland flow, are responsible for the secondary dispersal of seeds to new sites of the landscape.
65 Since successful regeneration by a plant depends upon its seeds being dispersed to safe sites
66 where seeds can germinate and seedlings can establish (Harper, 1977; Schupp, 1995), secondary
67 dispersal gives seeds new opportunities to reach favourable sites. This second chance may be of
68 vital importance for seeds in hostile environments with extreme environmental regimes where
69 most points of the landscape are unsuitable for seed germination, seed survival and seedling
70 establishment. This is the case ~~of~~ arid and semiarid environments, also called “drylands”, which

Eliminado: of

72 cover over 40% of the Earth's surface (Reynolds et al., 2007). These water-limited landscapes
73 frequently show a clear spatial pattern of vegetated patches interspersed within a bare soil
74 matrix (Aguiar and Sala, 1999) which gives rise to a mosaic-like structure of sources and sinks
75 of resources—the bare and vegetated patches respectively—with very different soil properties and
76 variable interconnection (e.g. Schlesinger et al., 1990; Ludwig and Tongway, 1995; Bochet et
77 al., 1999, 2000; Puigdefábregas, 2005). Vegetated patches have often been compared to
78 “fertility islands” with a privileged micro-climate and improved soil properties (low solar
79 radiation, low soil temperature, low evaporation rates, high concentration of resources, high
80 fertility, high infiltration rates,---) within a matrix of poor and degraded bare ground (low
81 fertility, high soil compaction, low water infiltration, high runoff volume, high wind and water
82 erosion rates,---) (e.g. Schlesinger et al., 1990; Puigdefábregas and Sánchez, 1996; Cerdà, 1997;
83 Bochet et al., 1998, 1999; Wilcox et al., 2003). Fertility islands may act as “nucleation” points
84 facilitating the establishment of plant species that otherwise would be unable to establish
85 (process of “facilitation”, Callaway, 2007). In this context, seeds dispersed from the parent plant
86 are scattered into a heterogeneous environment which is notoriously patchy in terms of the
87 quality of sites suitable for seed germination and for the subsequent survival of seedlings
88 (Schupp, 1995). Secondary dispersal may be therefore of vital importance for the recruitment
89 stage of plants and have relevant ecological implications in the functioning of dryland
90 ecosystems (Aguiar and Sala, 1997; Forget et al., 2002; Thompson et al., 2014).

91 Even so, secondary dispersal has generally received little attention in the scientific literature,
92 much less than primary dispersal (Chambers and Mc Mahon, 1994). An online literature
93 compilation of 697 papers on the fate of seeds in drylands published in the last 40 years
94 provides evidence of this clear unbalance (see Fig. 1 and reference list in the Supplement).

95 During this time period, only a small proportion of the annually published papers, less than one
96 third, is related to secondary dispersal (Fig. 1). However, the evolution of the number of papers
97 related to secondary seed dispersal in drylands shows a steady, even though fluctuating, increase
98 from the mid-1990s until 2013 (Fig. 2), indicating that what happens to seeds once they have

99 reached a first landing surface is becoming an increasingly important issue among the scientific
 100 community. Figure 2 also shows that the attention given to the main agents of secondary
 101 dispersal during the same time period is clearly uneven. Secondary dispersal by overland flow
 102 started to be documented later than secondary dispersal by wind and animals, and the annual
 103 rate of publications about secondary dispersal by overland flow has been very low since then.

Eliminado:

104 Because seed fate issues lie at the interface between plant, animal and soil sciences and because
 105 studies on secondary seed dispersal have seldom been published in soil science related journals
 106 (Fig. 3), this paper seeks to get readers, especially soil scientists, closer to the destiny of seeds in
 107 and on the soil. Understanding seed fate in the soil is not only a matter of the scientific
 108 community, but it is also crucial for the management of degraded ecosystems. Seeds are often
 109 one of the most important actors at the first stages of the restoration process, either through the
 110 influence of the soil seed bank which plays a fundamental role in the composition of the future
 111 vegetation (Peco et al., 1998), either through the use of seeding or hydroseeding revegetation
 112 techniques of disturbed areas (e.g. Tormo et al., 2007 for roadslopes; Fernández et al., 2012 for
 113 burnt areas; Porqueddu et al., 2013 for quarries).

Eliminado:

114 Our main goals are (1) to offer an updated conceptual model of seed fate with a special attention
 115 to seed destiny in and on the soil, (2) to review studies on secondary seed dispersal by runoff
 116 and the ecological implications this process has for the origin, spatial patterning and
 117 maintenance of patches in dryland ecosystems, and finally (3) to point out directions for future
 118 research. Our focus will be placed on drylands, because secondary dispersal has been
 119 recognized as a significant part of dispersal in environments with sparse vegetation (Nelson and
 120 Chew, 1977; Reichman, 1984; Chambers et al., 1991).

Eliminado: Our focus will be placed on drylands, because secondary dispersal has been recognized as a significant part of dispersal in environments with sparse vegetation (Nelson and Chew, 1977; Reichman, 1984; Chambers et al., 1991).

Eliminado: these

121
 122 **2. Conceptual model of seed fates and movements in and on the soil**

Eliminado: To prepare this review, we compiled literature from available peer reviewed journals, books, PhD theses, and from references cited in the previously mentioned bibliographic sources.¶

123 Different models of seed fate have been proposed to describe the complex pathways population
 124 of seeds might follow from seed production to seedling establishment. Since the early studies in
 125 the 1970s, models have progressively evolved and gained in complexity as new pathways of

140 seed movement and fate were found (Harper, 1977; Fenner, 1985; Chambers y Mc Mahon,
141 1994; Baskin and Baskin, 1998; Vander Wall et al., 2002). On the basis of these previous
142 models, ~~we propose in~~ Fig. 4 an updated conceptual model with a general description hereafter
143 of the most likely alternative pathways a seed might follow from seed production to seedling
144 establishment.

145 The model starts with the set of ripened seeds on the parent plant that have the potential to
146 germinate (Fig. 4). Part of these seeds may be lost to death by means of pre-dispersal predation
147 by animals or different types of disturbance affecting the parent plant (fire, water-logging,---).
148 Seeds that escape predation, may be primarily dispersed via specific biotic or abiotic agents
149 (animals, wind, rain, gravity,---) from the parent plant to a landing surface, the soil or any other
150 type of surface (trunks, branches, litter, rocks,---). Once on the soil surface, seeds may
151 experience different fates. First, they may germinate immediately if they have the chance to rest
152 on a microsite with suitable conditions for germination and are non-dormant (i.e.
153 physiologically active seeds). Second, seeds may be lost to death by post-dispersal predation
154 (ants, rodents or birds) or decay due to pathogen attacks or senescence (Hulme, 1998). Third,
155 seeds may rest at the initial point of deposition and ~~remain~~ on the soil surface for a short or long
156 period, depending on the dormancy state of the seed and the occurrence of favourable
157 conditions for germination. ~~Seed dormancy has to be broken by the agents responsible for~~
158 ~~dormancy alleviation (time, temperature, moisture) before seeds can germinate in favourable~~
159 ~~environmental conditions (e.g. light, improved oxygen levels,---).~~ Finally, seeds may be
160 subjected to secondary dispersal processes and moved to new sites via horizontal ~~or/and~~ vertical
161 seed movements.

162 Concerning vertical movements, seeds may be incorporated from the soil surface into the soil in
163 either a non-dormant or a dormant state and form the soil seed bank (Thompson et al., 1993;
164 ~~Traba et al. 2004~~). Seed entering into cracks at the soil surface, seed burial by small burrowing
165 animals or by local accumulation of sediments may enhance vertical seed movements
166 (Chambers and Mac Mahon, 1994; Chambers, 2000). Non-dormant seeds may germinate

Eliminado: persist

168 immediately once they have entered the soil ~~in case of favourable environmental conditions for~~
 169 ~~germination~~, and give rise to new seedlings if they are able to emerge above the soil surface.
 170 Dormant seeds may remain in the soil for long periods, waiting first for dormancy alleviation
 171 ~~and then for the occurrence of favourable environmental conditions for germination~~. Seeds may
 172 also be moved vertically by animals in the opposite direction, from the soil seed bank to the soil
 173 surface, or be brought to the soil surface by different kind of disturbances (runoff, wind, ...).
 174 Seeds on or in the soil may also be moved horizontally to new locations by different biotic
 175 (animals) or abiotic agents (often wind, runoff and gravity) and experience there the same fates
 176 as the ones described for seeds landing for the first time on the soil surface after primary
 177 dispersal.

Eliminado: species requirements

Eliminado: to be fulfilled

178 The following sections will focus on seed movements caused by runoff and their implications
 179 for ~~the~~ vegetation establishment and for the spatial organization and functioning of arid and
 180 semiarid patchy ecosystems.

Eliminado: horizontal

181

182 3. Seed removal by runoff: a review

183 3.1. Outcomes of seed removal by runoff: seed loss or seed redistribution?

184 In drylands, rainfall is often concentrated into a small number of intense high erosive events that
 185 are responsible for more than 70% of the soil loss rates (Wainwright, 1996; Martínez-
 186 Casanovas et al., 2005). Under these conditions, seeds in the seed bank or resting on the soil
 187 surface after primary dispersal are exposed to runoff flow, especially in bare patches where high
 188 rates of runoff and sediment transport have been reported (Cerdà, 1997; Calvo-Cases et al.,
 189 2003; Boix-Fayos et al., 2005; Bochet et al., 2006).

190 The first evidences that runoff may act as a vector of seed transport were indirect and based on
 191 observations of seed dispersal strategies in runoff-prone areas (Friedman and Orshan, 1975;
 192 Friedman and Stein, 1980), comparisons of plant distribution with different dispersal
 193 mechanisms between slopes and wadis (Reichman, 1984), or descriptions of seed distribution
 194 patterns in different microhabitats (Ellner and Schmida, 1981), in desert ecosystems worldwide.

198 In the 1990s, it was argued that seed removal by runoff led to seed loss and might explain the
199 lack or scarcity of vegetation on semiarid and arid hillslopes (Debusche and Lepart, 1992;
200 Francis, 1991; Chambers and Mac Mahon, 1994). Although frequently invoked, this assumption
201 was not empirically checked until the pioneering studies of García-Fayos and his collaborators
202 about seed transport by runoff flow. Their studies aimed at quantifying rates of seed losses in
203 order to determine whether seed removal by runoff could explain the lack of vegetation in
204 highly eroded badland slopes of Southeast Spain (García-Fayos and Recatalà, 1992; García-
205 Fayos et al., 1995; García-Fayos and Cerdà, 1997; Cerdà and García-Fayos, 1997, 2002; Table
206 1). In these stressful environments characterized by extreme rates of erosion (Gallart et al.,
207 2013), seed inputs into the soil seed bank due to seed ~~rain~~, were greater than the seed outputs due
208 to removal by erosion (21% and 5.6-12.6% of the soil seed bank, respectively), thus resulting in
209 a positive seed balance at the catchment scale (García-Fayos and Recatalá, 1992; García-Fayos
210 et al., 1995). In the same badland area, seed losses were quantified in several experimental
211 studies under simulated rainfall at 55 mm/h over 0.24 m² field plots with different slope angles
212 and rainfall durations (Table 1). In all cases, average seed losses by runoff for the whole set of
213 species were low (4%, 0.4 - 7.9% and <13% according to the experimental conditions of Cerdà
214 and García-Fayos, 1997; García-Fayos and Cerdà, 1997 and García-Fayos et al., 1995,
215 respectively) and seed loss rates of individual species did not exceed in any case 25% (García-
216 Fayos and Cerdà, 1997). These results were in agreement with average seed losses obtained
217 under natural conditions (García-Fayos et al., 1995) and also under laboratory conditions where
218 only 11% of the seeds resting on an artificial surface were lost in average under simulated
219 rainfall of similar intensity (Cerdà and García-Fayos, 2002, Table1). Moreover, the relationship
220 between the rate of seed loss and the amount of runoff proved to be positive and exponential in
221 these badland ecosystems (García-Fayos and Cerdà, 1997). According to all these results, it was
222 concluded that seed loss by overland flow was not the key factor explaining the absence of
223 vegetation on badland slopes as the probability of rainfall events of higher intensity and
224 duration is low. Other possible alternative causes were suggested and further investigated, such

225 | as scarce water availability for plants, high salinity, and the interaction of these latter factors
 226 | with seed germination (García-Fayos et al., 2000; Bochet et al., 2009).

227 | Recently, similar studies were carried out to test the same hypothesis in the Chinese Loess
 228 | Plateau, i.e. the scarcity of vegetation as a consequence of seed removal by runoff (Jiao et al.,
 229 | 2011; Han et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2013; see Table 1). Similar results to that documented in the
 230 | Spanish badland areas were obtained, since no seed losses were recorded in small bins filled
 231 | with soils collected from the field at a similar rainfall intensity (50 mm/h) and different slope
 232 | angles (Jiao et al., 2011; Han et al., 2011). However, the total amount of seeds lost by runoff
 233 | was closely related to runoff volume and sediment yield and average seed losses reached 32.6
 234 | and 66.0% values at intensities of 100 and 150 mm/h, respectively. Seed loss rates up to 100%
 235 | were described for some species in a similar laboratory experiment under 30 minute-simulated
 236 | rainfall at 120 mm/h (Wang et al., 2013). However, because rainstorm intensities heavier than
 237 | 50 mm/h are very occasional in the Chinese Loess Plateau, Jiao et al. (2011) concluded that
 238 | seed losses by runoff could not explain the scarcity of vegetation in the Chinese Loess Plateau
 239 | as it had been already pointed out for the semiarid badland slopes of Southeast Spain (García-
 240 | Fayos and Recatalà, 1992; García-Fayos et al., 1995).


241 | The general low rates of seed losses described in these studies may be due, in part, to the burial
 242 | of seeds into the soil after being trapped or at the time they get covered by local accumulations
 243 | of sediments transported by overland flow (Chambers et al., 1991).

244 | Moreover, ~~we should be cautious~~ when it comes to interpreting these data in terms of seed
 245 | losses for the ecosystem. Several authors have evidenced the limitations of extrapolating small-
 246 | plot erosion measurements -and their associated processes- to larger surfaces, because different
 247 | processes act at different scales (splash, interrill, rill and gully erosion) and thresholds and non-
 248 | linear processes are involved at specific scales and at the connection between scales (Govers,
 249 | 1991; Cammeraat, 2002). Therefore, seed losses by overland flow measured at the plot scale in
 250 | small areas (0.24 to 3 m², Table 1) and over short distances relative to the interpatch spacing in
 251 | patchy systems (< 2 m, Table 1) -as the ones reported in the aforementioned studies - could be

Eliminado: and the balance between seed inputs and outputs was positive

Eliminado: However

Eliminado:

256 considered seed displacements or seed translocations to new sites at the hillslope scale. ~~To~~ this
 257 respect, another body of research suggested that seeds transported by overland flow are not lost
 258 but redistributed along the slopes through downslope seed movements from one location to
 259 another. Aerts et al. (2006) reported that 21 to 61% of the seeds of the species *Olea europaea*
 260 were translocated to new sites under simulated rainfall within 3 x 3 m² plots placed in
 261 ~~restoration~~ forested areas in Ethiopia. Similarly, Jiao et al. (2011) and Han et al. (2011)
 262 described that 30-45, 46.9 and 20.4% of the seeds were moved from one site to another site
 263 inside a 1 m² and 2 m-long laboratory experimental bin at intensities of 50, 100 and 150mm/h,
 264 respectively, without being exported outside the bin. Using the same experimental setup, Wang
 265 et al. (2013) measured an average distance of 157.5 cm corresponding to seed redistribution by
 266 runoff within a 2 m-long bin which was longer than the length of the plots used by Cerdà and
 267 García-Fayos (1997) and García-Fayos and Cerdà (1997) to quantify seed loss rates. Thus,
 268 whether seeds are lost or redistributed may be a matter of scale and more studies quantifying
 269 seed transport by runoff are needed at larger scales, where processes other than sheet erosion
 270 may also take part in seed transport (e.g. rill and gully erosion). The only study, ~~to our~~
 271 ~~knowledge~~, that quantified seed transport by runoff at the slope and catchment scales ~~in~~
 272 ~~semiarid ecosystems~~ gives evidences of both outcomes, seed loss and seed redistribution
 273 (García-Fayos and Recatalà, 1992). On the one hand, these authors observed an increasing seed
 274 density in the downslope direction from the top to the bottom part of the slope that supports, ~~at~~
 275 ~~least in part~~, the hypothesis of seed redistribution along the slope. On the other hand, the 6 to
 276 20-fold difference in seed concentration at the outlets of catchments and in the regolith,
 277 demonstrates that seed losses out of the system also occur. ~~In other types of ecosystems~~  ~~such as~~
 278 ~~the temperate agro-ecosystems of the UK, Lewis et al. (2013) estimated that average soil loss~~
 279 ~~rates could export around 10% of the arable weed seed bank at the landscape scale in 20 years.~~

280

281 3.2. Factors influencing seed removal by runoff

282 3.2.1. External factors

283

284 | In some of the aforementioned studies, it was also claimed that several factors influence the
 285 | severity of seed transport by runoff (Table 1). A strong relationship was found between the
 286 | magnitude of seed transport by runoff and rainfall and slope characteristics. Similar to what
 287 | happens to soil particles (Govers, 1989; Parsons et al., 1993; de Vente and Poesen, 2005; Boix-
 288 | Fayos et al., 2006), seed losses increased as slope angle (García-Fayos et al., 1995; Jiao et al.,
 289 | 2011; Han et al., 2011; but Cerdà and García-Fayos, 1997) and rain duration and intensity
 290 | increased (García-Fayos et al., 1995; Jiao et al., 2011; Han et al., 2011), but it decreased with
 291 | soil surface roughness (Reichman, 1984; Chambers, 2000; Aerts et al., 2006; Isselin-Nondedeu
 292 | et al., 2006; Isselin-Nondedeu and Bédécarrats, 2007) and with total slope length (García-Fayos
 293 | et al., 1995). Soil texture also influenced seed losses, since larger soil particles increased the
 294 | amount of seeds trapped in the soil (Chambers et al., 1991; Traba et al., 2006). Results of these
 295 | studies also suggested that seed characteristics could obscure the relationships between runoff
 296 | and seed losses and were, therefore, further investigated (Friedman and Orshan, 1975; García-
 297 | Fayos et al., 1995; Cerdà and García-Fayos, 1997; García-Fayos and Cerdà, 1997; Han et al.,
 298 | 2011).

Eliminado: -

Eliminado: slope or

Eliminado: transport

299

300 3.2.2. Seed characteristics

301

302 | A body of research aimed at understanding the relationships between seed morphology and seed
 303 | removal by runoff (see Table 2) under the hypothesis that single seeds should behave in the
 304 | same way as soil particles regarding erosion and overland flow (García-Fayos and Cerdà, 1997).
 305 | Thus, because soil particle size and shape are considered good predictors of soil particle
 306 | susceptibility to removal (Kirkby, 1980; Poesen and Savat, 1980; Parsons et al., 1991) and
 307 | spherical soil particles are more susceptible to be removed by overland flow than plate-shaped
 308 | ones (Winkelmolen, 1971), similar trends were expected for seeds. Models based on laboratory
 309 | rainfall simulation experiments showed that seed size was the main factor explaining seed
 310 | removal, whereas the shape became important only when the seed size exceeded a specific
 311 | threshold value which depended on the experimental conditions (50 mg value in the

315 experimental conditions of Cerdà and García-Fayos, 2002; García-Fayos et al., 2010). This rule
316 was valid for spherical seeds, whereas for flat-shaped seeds heavier than 50 mg no seed removal
317 occurred from the threshold value 0.3 . The relevance of seed size and shape in the severity of
318 seed removal by runoff were later corroborated under **rainfall simulation** conditions for species
319 **living** in the Chinese Loess Plateau (Wang et al., 2013) and **under field conditions** in the French
320 Alps (Isselin-Nondedeu and Bédécarrats, 2007; Isselin-Nondedeu et al., 2006). In general terms,
321 likewise soil particles, small and rounded seeds proved to be more susceptible to removal by
322 runoff. However, further investigations demonstrated that the influence of seed characteristics
323 on seed removal was more complex as initially thought, because seed susceptibility to be
324 removed by runoff could be affected by other properties, such as the presence of seed
325 appendages (hairs, wings, awns) or the ability of seeds to secrete mucilage, a sticky gel that
326 forms around the seed once the seed comes in contact with water and glues the seeds to the
327 ground (García-Fayos, 2004; García-Fayos et al., 2010). The presence of appendages reduced
328 seed susceptibility to be removed by overland flow as regard seeds of similar weight that did not
329 have appendages (García-Fayos, 2004). Similarly, species with light seeds (≤ 0.7 mg) able to
330 secrete mucilage experienced 10% lower losses than the seeds with similar mass that did not
331 secrete mucilage (García-Fayos, 2004; García-Fayos et al., 2010).

332 Although less studied, seed buoyancy is another seed trait that may also influence seed
333 movement in surface water since buoyant seeds will be able to float and move with overland
334 flow when water depth is higher than the seed size (Thompson et al., 2014).

335 **Finally, some seed traits enhance the incorporation of seeds into the soil column and decrease**
336 **therefore the seed susceptibility to be removed by overland flow (Chambers et al., 1991). Small**
337 **seed size and a lack of appendages are relevant morphological attributes for seed incorporation**
338 **into the soil (Chambers et al., 1991), even though specialized appendages such as hygroscopic**
339 **awns can facilitate seed burial (Peart and Clifford, 1987). However, if seeds are buried too**
340 **deeply, especially small seeds, they can fail to act as functional seeds for the ecosystem (Traba**
341 **et al., 2004).**

Eliminado: field

Eliminado: 6

Eliminado: 7

345

346 **4. Long-term and large-scale ecological implications of seed removal by runoff in arid**
 347 **and semiarid ecosystems**

348

349 **4.1. Seed removal by runoff: an ecological driver of vegetation**

350 *4.1.1. Seed removal by runoff shapes plant community composition (community level)*

351

352 Although average seed losses by runoff measured in dryland plant communities were generally
 353 low, specific seed losses rates varied strongly among species within a plant community (García-
 354 Fayos et al., 1995; Jiao et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2013) as a result of the interaction between the
 355 seed morphology and overland flow. Consequently, seed removal by runoff is expected to
 356 contribute to ~~determine~~ the final plant composition of eroded environments.

357 Several recent studies aimed at exploring whether soil erosion, through its effects on seed
 358 removal by runoff, could explain the composition of plant community on eroded slopes in
 359 dryland ecosystems (Bochet et al., 2009; García-Fayos et al., 2010; García-Fayos et al., 2013;
 360 Wang et al., 2013; Engelbrecht et al., 2014). García-Fayos et al. (2010) found that the average
 361 susceptibility of seeds to be removed by runoff was lower for plant communities of species
 362 living on steep slopes than for plant communities developing in flat areas in a semiarid area of
 363 East Spain (but Wang et al., 2013 for a similar study in the Chinese Loess Plateau). Moreover,
 364 the proportion of species possessing a trait able to improve seed resistance to removal by runoff
 365 (mucilage secretion or presence of hygroscopic awns), varied between plant communities, with
 366 a higher proportion of seeds displaying anchorage mechanisms on the eroded slopes ~~as regard~~
 367 the flat areas (Bochet et al., 2009; García-Fayos et al., 2013). This proportion was also
 368 correlated with soil properties ~~associated with~~ runoff generation (García-Fayos et al., 2013).

369 After analyzing the physical properties of seeds from ~~species~~ living in different deserts of the
 370 world, Thompson et al. (2014) observed that all the ~~species~~ analyzed, except one, produced
 371 seeds with lower densities than ~~water~~, being therefore able to float and be transported by
 372 overland flow. However, these results should be corroborated with data from ~~species~~ living in

Eliminado: related to

Eliminado: plants

Eliminado: plants

Eliminado: the

Eliminado: plants

378 areas where overland flow is absent, before any conclusion can be stated about the role of
379 erosion in this association.

380 Overall, these results provide evidence that erosion -through its selective pressure on seeds by
381 overland flow and the interaction of this latter with seed morphology- filters plant species at the
382 community level from the very first stages of the plant life. The role of erosion as an ecological
383 driver that shapes the composition of plant communities had already been highlighted in
384 previous studies in arid and semiarid environments (Guàrdia et al., 2000; Guerrero-Campo and
385 Montserrat-Martí 2000, 2004; García-Fayos and Bochet, 2009; Bochet et al., 2009; Jiao et al.,
386 2009). However, relative little attention had been paid to the effect of erosion on seeds (mainly
387 seed transport and germination) as compared to later stages of the plant life (seedlings and adult
388 plants, de Luís et al., 2005; Tsuyuzaki and Haruki, 2008; Wang et al., 2012), even though seed
389 stage is one of the most critical phases in vegetation development (García-Fayos and Cerdà,
390 1997).

391

392 *4.1.2. Seed removal by runoff selects for seed traits and for adaptative plant strategies*
393 *(species level)*

394

395 As already mentioned and further explained in section 3.3, seed redistribution by runoff can
396 provide seeds with a second chance to lie in a more favourable site for seed germination and
397 seedling establishment in arid and semiarid patchy ecosystems. In some cases, however, seed
398 removal by runoff can be responsible for the loss of seed germination opportunities when seeds
399 of plants inhabiting eroded hillslopes are moved downhill to less favourable sites where seeds
400 can get deeply buried or suffer from strong competition with other seedlings or pre-established
401 plants in water- and nutrient-rich soils (Cantón et al., 2004). As a result, plants may have
402 evolved strategies to escape from massive seed loss to unsafe sites (Engelbrecht, 2014). To this
403 respect, the possible adaptative value of mucilage secretion under desert conditions as a
404 mechanism preventing seed removal by runoff was initially proposed by Ellner & Shmida
405 (1981) and recently explored by Engelbrecht et al. (2014). These authors analyzed at the species
406 level whether mucilage secretion can be considered an adaptative response to soil erosion in

407 plant species inhabiting semiarid environments. More specifically, they related the amount of
408 mucilage secretion by seeds to the severity of the two main sub-processes whereby water
409 erosion proceeds on soil particles and presumably also on seeds (i.e. splash detachment and
410 overland flow transport). The amount of mucilage secreted by seeds of the species *Fumana*
411 *ericifolia* was directly proportional to their resistance to raindrop impact and was, moreover,
412 positively related to the intensity of the erosive processes that the plants experienced in the field
413 in semiarid Mediterranean shrublands. Furthermore, according to overland transport, all the
414 seeds resisted the strength of runoff irrespective of the amount of mucilage they produced.
415 However, the effect of mucilage secretion in the rate of seed removal by erosion was species-
416 dependent and Engelbrecht et al. (2014) concluded that their results only partially supported the
417 idea that seed anchorage mechanisms to the ground, such as mucilage secretion, can be
418 considered an adaptation to the hazards that erosive conditions impose to plants that inhabits
419 open dry habitats.

420

421 ***4.2. Seed removal by runoff influences the origin, spatial pattern and maintenance of patches***
422 ***in arid and semiarid ecosystems***

423 A few studies have investigated the long-term and large-scale ecological implications of seed
424 removal by runoff in the structure and functioning of arid and semiarid ecosystems worldwide
425 (e.g. Aguiar and Sala, 1997, 1999; Schurr et al., 2004; Puigdefábregas, 2005; Aerts et al., 2006;
426 Saco et al., 2007; Venable et al., 2008; Emmerson et al., 2012; Thompson et al., 2014). Figure 5
427 illustrates schematically these implications on the basis of the available literature described
428 hereafter.

429 Various hypotheses have been put forward to explain the origin, spatial distribution and
430 maintenance of patches in arid and semiarid ecosystems (e.g. Dunkerley et al., 1995; Pueyo et
431 al., 2008; Kefi et al., 2008). Variations in slope angle and the presence of local accumulations of
432 organic debris and sediments, depressions in the soil surface, rocks or ant mounds on nearly
433 bare slopes have been reported as possible physical obstacles to overland flow that can enhance

434 local germination of entrapped seeds and further establishment of seedlings (e.g. MacFadyen,
435 1950; Reichman, 1984; Aguiar and Sala, 1997; Chambers, 2000; Venable et al., 2008).
436 Alternatively, seed anchorage mechanisms (mucilage and hygroscopic awns), can also be
437 instruments whereby new patches of vegetation originate on eroded hillslopes (García-Fayos et
438 al., 2013).

439 Whatever their origin, once a seedling establishes from a germinated seed, it interacts with
440 overland flow intercepting the downslope movement of water, sediments and nutrients,
441 improving locally the fertility and water availability below the plant canopy and favouring the
442 growth of the plant and the patch (Cerdà, 1997; Bochet et al., 1999; Puigdefábregas, 2005). As a
443 result, the system becomes ~~notoriously~~ heterogeneous in terms of the quality of sites suitable for
444 seed germination, the subsequent survival of seedlings and the resources available for plant
445 growth (Schupp, 1995). Spatial heterogeneity is promoted and maintained by complex
446 interactions between patches and overland flow in a self-organizing process (Rietkerk et al.,
447 2004).

448 These complex interactions give rise to two main spatial vegetation patterns that can be found
449 worldwide: on the one hand, “spotted” patterns are represented by vegetation clusters that are
450 irregular in shape and surrounded by bare soil (Aguiar and Sala, 1999) and, on the other hand,
451 “banded” patterns form densely vegetated stripes parallel to the contour lines that alternate with
452 almost bare soil stripes on very gentle slopes (Valentin et al., 1999). Nowadays, there is general
453 agreement that surface runoff is a key ~~condition for~~ the appearance of such vegetation patterns
454 and that the dynamics of runoff-runoff areas is the main driver of the spatial organization of such
455 patterned ecosystems (e.g. Valentin et al., 1999; Tongway and Ludwig, 2001). Recently,
456 Moreno-de las Heras et al. (2011) recognized ~~moreover~~ the importance of the directional
457 downslope redistribution of surface runoff and sediments in the periodicity of the patch-size
458 distribution in banded landscapes in Australia. More specifically, they argued that the co-
459 existence of long-distance negative vegetation-water feedbacks (including downslope
460 redistribution of runoff and plant competition for water) and short-distance positive feedbacks

461 (local plant facilitation) are responsible for the regular patterns of the vegetation. Although seed
462 dispersal and fate should play a crucial role in these feedback mechanisms (Kefi et al., 2008;
463 Pueyo et al., 2008), the role of surface runoff, as a vector of seed transport, in the functioning
464 and maintenance of patchy ecosystems has been poorly documented.

465 The existing literature, based on empirical as well as theoretical studies, mainly supports the
466 idea that a patch-to-patch transfer of seeds occurs that helps maintaining the patchy structure of
467 the vegetation. The patch-to-patch transfer of seeds results from a combination of a “directed”
468 dispersal of seeds through runoff to areas with favorable conditions (Howe and Smallwood,
469 1982) and the high plant capacity to trap seeds. Aguiar and Sala (1997) provided strong
470 empirical evidence that high seed transit due to secondary dispersal agents (mainly wind but
471 also water) occurred in bare inter-patch areas in the Patagonian steppe of Argentina, at the same
472 time as they reported high rates of seed trapping by the vegetation, whereas bare areas were
473 unable to retain almost any seed. Similar results showing the patchy distribution of the seed
474 bank and its concentration mainly in vegetated patches have been described in the Sonoran
475 Desert of Arizona (Reichman, 1984) and in banded landscapes of Mexico and Niger
476 (Mauchamp et al., 1993; Seghieri et al., 1997). Moreover, Aguiar and Sala (1997) observed that
477 overlapping of high seed densities with the availability of safe sites gave rise to successful
478 recruitment near the vegetated patches and helped maintaining or even reinforced the current
479 spatial heterogeneity of the system. In banded landscapes, seeds trapped by the vegetation are
480 present throughout the bands, but the better water availability at the upslope edge of bands, and
481 the smaller runoff volume passing through to the downslope edge, leads to the colonization of
482 the upslope edge by pioneer species and to the progressive death of plants at the downslope
483 edge (Seguieri et al., 1997; Valentin et al., 1999). A possible outcome that has been inferred
484 from these observations by many authors, that remains a controversial topic today, is that the
485 vegetation patterning migrates progressively upslope (Thiéry et al. 1995; Montaña et al. 2001;
486 Deblauwe et al. 2012). Nevertheless, the use of new technologies in the study of slow
487 ecosystem dynamics (e.g. high resolution satellite images and airborne photographic surveys)

488 provided recently unequivocal photographic evidence of marked upslope migration for different
489 dryland areas exhibiting banded patterns worldwide (e.g. northeastern Chihuahan desert,
490 Somalian Haud and Mediterranean steppes of eastern Morocco, Deblauwe et al. 2012). In the
491 same study, however, Deblauwe et al. (2012) stated that ~~this~~ dynamics which proved to be
492 widely influenced by weather regime, cannot be considered as systematic because migration was
493 undetectable at the available image resolution in other banded systems they investigated (e.g.
494 central Australia, western New South Wales). The reasons causing some banded patterns to
495 move fast and others to be static are still elusive. Deblauwe et al. (2012) provide a review of
496 some possible mechanisms that may induce these differences, including seed translocation by
497 overland flow. In a recent model, Saco et al. (2007) related the migrating or stationary condition
498 of bands to the dispersal of seeds by overland flow. They found that the anisotropic
499 redistribution of seeds by surface flow downslope might prevent the bands from traveling
500 upstream, whereas isotropic seed dispersal mechanisms might be responsible for upslope band
501 migration. However, empirical studies investigating seed fluxes are needed to validate this
502 model and the possible migration-impeding role of seed redistribution. As regard banded
503 patterns, the dynamics of spotted vegetation might be more complex, as the former usually acts
504 as closed hydrological systems and the latter highly depends on the connectivity of bare areas
505 (Saco et al., 2007). Recent studies demonstrate that it is not only the extent to which vegetation
506 patches prevail on a slope (Parsons et al., 1996; Wainwright et al., 2000; Bochet et al., 2000;
507 Puigdefábregas, 2005), but mainly the connectivity of bare areas that influences hydrological
508 processes such as runoff and sediment transport (Bautista et al., 2007; Puttock et al., 2013).
509 Connectivity has the advantage as regard vegetation structure to provide an explanatory link
510 between abiotic and biotic components to determine the hydrological and ecological function of
511 the system (Turnbull et al., 2008, 2010). In their ecohydrological conceptual framework,
512 Turnbull et al. (2008) hypothesized that structural connectivity -which determines the amount
513 and extent of abiotic and biotic resource redistribution- is the key determinant of the
514 connectivity of ecological and hydrological processes, and thus, of the functional connectivity

515 which includes water_r and seed movement among the landscape. Thompson et al. (2014)
516 recently developed a theoretical model of seed dispersal processes by runoff where hydrological
517 connectivity was considered as an influencing variable on seed movement by overland flow.
518 The model supported the hypothesis of a patch-to-patch transmission of seeds under specific
519 conditions of rainfall and connectivity between patches. According to the model, either long and
520 intense storms heavy enough to trigger seed movement and to induce transport distances
521 comparable to the inter-patch bare spacing or, repeated storms allowing repeated seed transport
522 are required in combination with high topographical and hydrological connectivity to generate a
523 patch-to-patch transport of seeds.

524 In the reviewed literature, however, a few empirical studies do not support the patch-to-patch
525 hypothesis. These studies highlight the absence of seed movement from the bare inter-patch
526 areas to the vegetation patches in combination with a low seed trapping capacity by the
527 vegetation (Aerts et al. 2006) or with short dispersal distances relative to the pattern of spatial
528 heterogeneity (Venable et al., 2008; Emmerson et al., 2010, 2012). The authors concluded that
529 successful recruitment of the species used in these experiments could not rely on seed transport
530 by runoff but depended on other mechanisms such as primary dispersal (Aerts et al., 2006) or
531 the temporal delay of germination (Venable et al., 2008; Siewert and Tielborger, 2010).


532 Overall, in arid and semiarid patchy ecosystems, seed fate in overland flow seems to be
533 determined by the spatial organization of the vegetation and by the hydrological connectivity of
534 bare patches that appear to influence the origin and maintenance of patches (Fig. 5). A range of
535 abiotic as well as biotic processes contribute to the structure and functioning of these
536 ecosystems, whereby seed establishment influences overland flow and, in turn, overland flow –
537 through the directed transport of seeds between connected vegetated patches- influences
538 vegetation establishment and patch dynamics (Moreno-de las Heras et al., 2011).

540

541 **5. Directions for future research**

542 This review shows that repeated seed transport by overland flow leads to either seed losses from
543 the system or the redistribution of seeds within the system through short seed movements.
544 Because seed losses by runoff were generally low in field conditions, we should be aware of the
545 risks of over-interpreting the role of seed losses by erosion in the structuring of plant
546 communities (García-Fayos et al., 2010). Possible reasons explaining the low rates of seed
547 losses reported in the literature should be further investigated behind seed burial into the soil
548 through vertical movements (Chambers and Mac Mahon, 1994; Chambers, 2000) and the lack
549 of data of seed losses caused by erosion processes acting at larger spatial scales and responsible
550 for the largest proportions of soil loss in these ecosystem (but Espigares et al., 2011).
551 Conversely, seed removal in terms of seed displacements to short distances proved to play an
552 important role in the vegetation composition and spatial patterning of arid and semiarid patchy
553 ecosystems, through the interaction between vegetated patches, overland flow carrying the seeds
554 downslope and seed traits. Thus, the directed short-distance displacement of seeds to suitable
555 sites where seeds are preferentially trapped by the vegetated patches result in a “patch-to-patch
556 transport” of seeds through well connected bare areas, that helps maintaining the patchiness of
557 the system.

558 Since recent models have related the origin and maintenance of patchiness to the lack of long-
559 distance dispersal syndromes for plants living in arid and semiarid ecosystems (Pueyo et al.,
560 2008; Kefi et al., 2008), an exciting challenge for the future would be to link these models to
561 field data of seed removal by runoff. The idea that dispersal is spatially limited in arid and
562 semiarid ecosystems (Ellner and Schmid, 1981) and the idea that seeds are removed by runoff
563 in such ecosystems may not be as contradictory as it has been shown that seed removal acts
564 mainly through short seed displacements within the system. Therefore, more empirical studies
565 are needed to understand the relevance of seeds moved by runoff in the broader context of long-
566 distance negative feedbacks (spatial redistribution of surface runoff and plant competition for
567 water) and short-distance positive feedbacks (local plant facilitation) that seem to control the
568 functioning of these ecosystems (Pueyo et al., 2008; Kefi et al., 2008; Turnbull et al., 2008).

569  cause arid and semiarid ecosystems are experiencing increasing pressures by human activities
570 and climate change and because future scenarios of climate change predict changes in
571 | vegetation (type, cover and spatial distribution, [Specht and Specht, 1995](#)) and in rainfall
572 | distribution (higher intensive rainstorms, [Nearing et al., 2004](#)), leading both to more intense
573 | erosion events, we should be able to understand how these changes might influence seed
574 | movements in overland flow and their consequences for the composition, structure and
575 | functioning of these ecosystems. Under such scenarios, the complex feedbacks between the
576 | spatial distribution of the vegetation, runoff and erosion that influence the spatial redistribution
577 | of abiotic and biotic resources among the landscape may experience severe changes (Turnbull et
578 | al., 2008, 2011). For example, a reduced or altered distribution of the vegetation and an
579 | increased connectivity of bare runoff-generating areas would result in higher velocities and
580 | erosive forces of the flow and, consequently, a higher flow capacity to transport sediment,
581 | nutrients and also seeds. It is suggested that when the internal system stabilizing feedbacks are
582 | altered by exogenous forces, the resilience of the ecosystem (i.e. its capacity to absorb
583 | disturbance and reorganize) changes and the system becomes more sensitive to experience
584 | nonlinear functional dynamics and cross critical thresholds (Turnbull et al., 2008, 2011).
585 | Therefore, there is an urgent need for new experimental studies addressing the feedbacks
586 | between structure and function and abiotic and biotic components of systems, that may help to
587 | predict future changes in semi-arid ecosystems under the scenarios of climate change.

588 | Understanding the fate of seeds in overland flow is also a critical issue for the successful
589 | restoration of severely eroded slopes (such as road embankments, roadcuts, mine spoils, burnt
590 | areas,---). The advances in the knowledge of significant seed characteristics able to prevent seed
591 | removal by runoff and of the trapping efficiency of plants, litters and depressions in the soil
592 | surface and their consequences on successful plant recruitment, are of potential great benefit to
593 | practitioners and policy makers involved in roadslope restoration (Rey et al., 2005). The use of
594 | recently developed models combining overland flow dynamics with seed fate and erosion can
595 | also be of great benefit to design restoration projects of plant communities on eroded hillslopes

Eliminado: ,

597 (Thompson et al., 2014). However, a great effort should be ~~done~~ among the scientific
598 community to improve the ways to quickly and efficiently transfer this available knowledge to
599 institutions devoted to restoration (Valladares and Gianoli, 2007).

600
601 In conclusion, an interdisciplinary approach, involving scientists from different fields related to
602 plant, soil, geomorphology, hydrology, ecological restoration and modelling should broaden our
603 understanding of seed fate in overland flow and its ecogeomorphological consequences in
604 | vegetation structure and functioning ~~and help filling in~~ the aforementioned gaps.

Eliminado: -

605

606 **Acknowledgements**

607 I am indebted to Artemi Cerdà and the Executive Editors of *SOIL* for their kind invitation to
608 prepare this review. I am also grateful to Patricio García-Fayos for his suggestions that helped
609 | improving the manuscript. I thank ~~R.E. Brazier as~~ Topical Editor, ~~and Begoña Peco, Artemi~~
610 | ~~Cerdà and two other anonymous referees as reviewers~~ for providing helpful comments to
611 improve the manuscript.

Eliminado: , as

Eliminado: ,

612

613

617 **References**

- 618 Aerts, R., Maes, W., November, E., Behailu, M., Poesen, J., Deckers, J., Hermy, M., and Muys, B.:
619 Surface runoff and seed trapping efficiency of shrubs in a regenerating semiarid woodland in northern
620 Ethiopia, *Catena*, 65, 61-70, 2006.
- 621 Aguiar, M.R. and Sala, O.E.: Patch structure, dynamics and implications for the functioning of arid
622 ecosystems, *Trends Ecol Evol*, 14, 273-277, 1999.
- 623 Aguiar, M.R. and Sala, O.E.: Seed distribution constrains the dynamics of the Patagonian steppe,
624 *Ecology*, 78, 93-100, 1997.
- 625 Baskin, C.C. and Baskin, J.M. (Eds): *Seeds. Ecology, Biogeography, and Evolution of Dormancy and*
626 *Germination*, Academic Press, London, UK, 1998.
- 627 Bautista, S., Mayor, A., Bourakhouadar, J., and Bellot, J.: Plant spatial pattern predicts hillslope runoff
628 and erosion in a semiarid mediterranean landscape, *Ecosystems*, 10, 987-998, 2007.
- 629 Bochet, E., García-Fayos, P., and Poesen, J.: Topographic thresholds for plant colonization on semiarid
630 eroded slopes, *Earth Surf Proc Land* 34, 1758-1771, 2009.
- 631 Bochet, E., Poesen, J., and Rubio, J.L.: Runoff and soil loss under individual plants of a semi-arid
632 Mediterranean shrubland: influence of plant morphology and rainfall intensity, *Earth Surf Proc Land*,
633 31, 536-549, 2006.
- 634 Bochet, E., Poesen, J., and Rubio, J.L.: Mound development as an interaction of individual plants with
635 soil, water erosion and sedimentation processes on slopes. *Earth Surf Proc Land*, 25, 847-867, 2000.
- 636 Bochet, E., Rubio, J.L., and Poesen, J.: Modified top soil islands within a patchy Mediterranean
637 vegetation in SE Spain, *Catena*, 38, 23-44, 1999.
- 638 Bochet, E., Rubio, J.L., and Poesen, J.: Relative efficiency of representative matorral species in reducing
639 water erosion at the microscale in a semi-arid climate. *Geomorphology*, 23, 139-150, 1998.
- 640 Böhning-Gaese, K., Gaese, B.H., and Rabemanantsoa, S.B.: Importance of primary and secondary
641 dispersal in the Malagasy tree *Commiphora guillaumini*, *Ecology*, 80, 821-832, 1999.
- 642 Boix-Fayos, C., Martínez-Mena, M., Arnau-Rosalén, E., Calvo-Cases, A., Castillo, V., and Albaladejo, J.:
643 Measuring soil erosion by field plots: understanding the sources of variation, *Earth-Sci Rev* 78, 267-
644 285, 2006.
- 645 Boix-Fayos, C., Martínez-Mena, M., Calvo-Cases, A., Castillo, V., and Albaladejo, J.: Concise review of
646 interrill erosion studies in SE Spain (Alicante and Murcia): erosion rates and progress of knowledge
647 in the last two decades, *Land Degrad Dev*, 16, 517-528, 2005.
- 648 Bullock, J.M., Shea, K., and Skarpaas, O.: Measuring plant dispersal: an introduction to field methods
649 and experimental design, *Plant Ecol*, 186, 217-234, 2006.
- 650 Callaway, R.M. (Ed.): *Positive Interactions and Interdependence in Plant Communities*, Springer,
651 Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 2007.
- 652 Calvo, A., Boix, C., Imeson, A.C.: Runoff generation, sediment movement and soil water behaviour on
653 calcareous (limestone) slopes of some mediterranean environments in southeast Spain,
654 *Geomorphology*, 50, 269-291, 2003.
- 655 Cammeraat, L.H.: A review of two strongly contrasting geomorphological systems within the context of
656 scale, *Earth Surf Proc Land*, 27, 1201-1222, 2002.
- 657 Cantón, Y., del Barrio, G., Solé-Benet, A., and Lázaro, R.: Topographic controls on the spatial
658 distribution of ground cover in the Tabernas badlands of SE Spain, *Catena*, 55, 341-365, 2004.
- 659 Cerdà, A.: The effect of patchy distribution of *Stipa tenacissima* L. on runoff and erosion, *J Arid Environ*,
660 36, 37-51, 1997.
- 661 Cerdà, A. and García-Fayos, P.: The influence of seed size and shape on their removal by water erosion,
662 *Catena*, 48, 293-301, 2002.
- 663 Cerdà, A. and García-Fayos, P.: The influence of slope angle on sediment, water and seed losses on
664 badland landscapes, *Geomorphology*, 18, 77-90, 1997.
- 665 Chambers, J.C.: Seed movements and seedling fates in disturbed sagebrush steppe ecosystems:
666 implications for restoration, *Ecol Appl*, 10, 1400-1413, 2000.
- 667 Chambers, J.C. and MacMahon, J.A.: A day in the life of a seed: movements and fates of seeds and their
668 implications for natural and managed systems, *Annu Rev Ecol Syst*, 25, 263-292, 1994.
- 669 Chambers, J.C., MacMahon, J.A., and Haefner, J.H.: Seed entrapment in alpine ecosystems: effects of
670 soil particle size and diaspore morphology, *Ecology*, 72, 1668-1677, 1991.
- 671 de Luís, M., Raventós, J., and González-Hidalgo, J.C.: Fire and torrential rainfall: Effects on seedling
672 establishment in Mediterranean gorse shrublands, *Int J Wildland Fire*, 14, 413-422, 2005.
- 673 de Vente, J. and Poesen, J.: Predicting soil erosion and sediment yield at the basin scale: scale issues and
674 semi-quantitative models, *Earth-Sci Rev*, 71, 95-125, 2005.

- 675 | Deblauwe, V., Couteron, P., Bogaert, J., and Barbier, N.: Determinants and dynamics of banded
676 | vegetation pattern migration in arid climates, *Ecol Monogr*, 82, 3-21, 2012.
- 677 | Debusche, M. and Lepart, J.: Establishment of woody plants in mediterranean old-fields: opportunity in
678 | space and time, *Landscape Ecol*, 6, 133-145, 1992.
- 679 | Dunkerley, D.L., and Brown, K.J.: Runoff and runoff areas in a patterned chenopod shrubland, arid
680 | western New South Wales, Australia: characteristics and origin, *J Arid Environ*, 30, 41-55, 1995.
- 681 | Ellner, S. and Shmida, A.: Why are adaptations for long-range seed dispersal rare in desert plants?
682 | *Oecologia*, 51, 133-144, 1981.
- 683 | Emmerson, L.M., Facelli, J.M., Chesson, P., Possingham, H., and Day, J.R.: Changes in seed dispersal
684 | processes and the potential for between patch connectivity for an arid land daisy, *Ecology*, 93, 544-
685 | 553, 2012.
- 686 | Emmerson, L., Facelli, J.M., Chesson, P., and Possingham, H.: Secondary seed dispersal of
687 | *Erodiohyllum elderi*, a patchily distributed shortlived perennial in the arid lands of Australia,
688 | *Austral Ecol*, 35, 906-918, 2010.
- 689 | Engelbrecht, M.: Mucilage secretion in seeds of Mediterranean species: hypotheses about its origin and
690 | function, Ph.D. thesis, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Facultad de Ciencias Biológicas,
691 | Departamento de Ecología, Spain, 199 pp., 2014.
- 692 | Engelbrecht, M., Bochet, E., and García-Fayos, P.: Mucilage secretion: an adaptive mechanism to reduce
693 | seed removal by soil erosion?, *Biol J Linn Soc*, 111, 241-251, 2014.
- 694 | Espigares, T., Moreno-de las Heras, M., and Nicolau, J.M.: Performance of vegetation in reclaimed slopes
695 | affected by soil erosion, *Restor Ecol*, 19, 35-44, 2011.
- 696 | Fenner, M. (Ed.): *Seed Ecology*, Chapman and Hall, New York, USA, 151 pp., 1985.
- 697 | **Fernández, C., Vega, J.A., Jiménez, E., Vieira, D.C.S., Merino, A., Ferreira, A., and Fonturbel, T.:**
698 | **Seeding and mulching + seeding effects on post-fire runoff, soil erosion and species diversity in**
699 | **Galicia (NW Spain), *Land Degrad Dev*, 23, 150-156, 2012.**
- 700 | Forget, P.M. and Milleron, T.: Evidence for secondary seed dispersal in Panama. *Oecologia*, 87, 596-599,
701 | 1991.
- 702 | Forget, P.M. and Wenny, D.G.: How to elucidate seed fate? A review of methods used to study seed
703 | removal and secondary seed dispersal, in: *Seed Fate. Predation, Dispersal and Seedling*
704 | *Establishment*, Forget, P., Lambert, J., Hulme, P., and Vander Wall, S. (Eds.), Cabi Publishing, UK,
705 | 379-393, 2002.
- 706 | Francis, C.F.: Soil erosion and organic matter losses on fallow land: A case study from south-east Spain,
707 | in: *Soil Erosion on Agricultural Land*, Boardman, J., Foster, I.D.L., and Dearing, J.A. (Eds.), Wiley,
708 | Chichester, UK, 331-338, 1991.
- 709 | Friedman, J. and Orshan, G.: The distribution, emergence and survival of seedlings of *Artemisia herba-*
710 | *alba* asso in the Negev Desert of Israel in relation to distance from the adult plants, *J Ecol*, 63, 627-
711 | 632, 1975.
- 712 | Friedman, J. and Stein, Z.: The influence of seed-dispersal mechanisms on the dispersion of *Anastatica*
713 | *hierochuntica* (Cruciferae) in the Negev Desert, Israel, *J Ecol*, 68, 43-50, 1980.
- 714 | Gallart, F., Marignani, M., Pérez-Gallego, N., Santi, E., and Maccherini, S.: Thirty years of studies on
715 | badlands, from physical to vegetational approaches. A succinct review, *Catena*, 106, 4-11, 2013.
- 716 | García-Fayos, P.: Interacciones entre la vegetación y la erosión hídrica, in: *Ecología del bosque*
717 | *mediterráneo en un mundo cambiante*, Valladares, F. (Ed.), Ministerio de Medio Ambiente, EGRAF,
718 | S.A., Madrid., Spain, 309-334, 2004.
- 719 | García-Fayos, P. and Bochet, E.: Indication of antagonistic interaction between climate change and
720 | erosion on plant species richness and soil properties in semiarid Mediterranean ecosystems, *Global*
721 | *Change Biol*, 15, 306-318, 2009.
- 722 | García-Fayos, P. and Cerdà, A.: Seed losses by surface wash in degraded Mediterranean environments,
723 | *Catena*, 29, 73-83, 1997.
- 724 | García-Fayos, P. and Recatalà, R.M.: La reserva de semillas en una cuenca de "badlands" (Petrer,
725 | Alicante), *Pirineos, Revista de Ecología de Montaña*, 140, 29-36, 1992.
- 726 | García-Fayos, P., Engelbrecht, M., and Bochet, E.: Postdispersal seed anchorage to soil in semi-arid plant
727 | communities, a test of the hypothesis of Ellner and Shmida. *Plant Ecol*, 214, 941-952, 2013.
- 728 | García-Fayos P., Bochet, E., and Cerdà, A.: Seed removal susceptibility through soil erosion shapes
729 | vegetation composition, *Plant Soil*, 334, 289-297, 2010.
- 730 | García-Fayos, P., García-Ventoso, B., and Cerdà, A.: Limitations to plant establishment on eroded slopes
731 | in southeastern Spain, *J Veg Sci*, 11, 77-86, 2000.
- 732 | García-Fayos, P., Cerdà, A., Recatalá, T.M., and Calvo, A.: Seed population dynamics on badland slopes
733 | in SE Spain, *J Veg Sci*, 6, 691-696, 1995.

Con formato: Inglés (Estados Unidos)

Con formato: Inglés (Estados Unidos)

Eliminado:

- 735 Govers, G.: A field study on topographical and topsoil effects on runoff generation, *Catena*, 18, 91-111,
736 1991.
- 737 Govers, G.: Grain velocities in overland flow: A laboratory experiment. *Earth Surf Proc Land*, 14, 481-
738 489, 1989.
- 739 Guàrdia, R., Gallart, F., and Ninot, J.M.: Soil seed bank and seedling dynamics in badlands of the Upper
740 Llobregat Basin (Pyrenees), *Catena*, 40, 189-202, 2000.
- 741 Guerrero-Campo, J. and Montserrat-Martí, G.: Comparison of floristic changes on vegetation affected by
742 different levels of soil erosion in Miocene clays and Eocene marls from Northeast Spain, *Plant Ecol*,
743 173, 83-93, 2004.
- 744 Guerrero-Campo, J. and Montserrat-Martí, G.: Effects of soil erosion on the floristic composition of plant
745 communities on marl in northeast Spain, *J Veg Sci* 11, 329-336, 2000.
- 746 Han, L., Jiao, J., Jia, Y., Wang, N., Lei, D., and Li, L.: Seed removal on loess slopes in relation to runoff
747 and sediment yield, *Catena*, 85, 12-21, 2011.
- 748 Harper, J.L. (Ed.): *Population Biology of Plants*, Academic Press, London, UK, 1977.
- 749 Howe, H.F. and Smallwood, J.: Ecology of seed dispersal. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst*, 13, 201-228, 1982.
- 750 Hulme, P.E. Post-dispersal seed predation: consequences for plant demography and evolution, *Perspect*
751 *Plant Ecol*, 1, 32-46, 1998.
- 752 Isselin-Nondedeu, F. and Bédécarrats, A.: Soil microtopographies shaped by plants and cattle facilitate
753 seed bank formation on alpine ski trails, *Ecol Eng*, 30, 278-285, 2007.
- 754 Isselin-Nondedeu, F., Rey, F., and Bédécarrats, A.: Contributions of vegetation cover and cattle hoof
755 prints towards seed runoff control on ski pistes, *Ecol Eng*, 27, 193-201, 2006.
- 756 Jiao, J., Han, L., Jia, Y., Wang, N., Lei, D., and Li, L.: Can seed removal through soil erosion explain the
757 scarcity of vegetation in the Chinese Loess Plateau?, *Geomorphology*, 132, 3-40, 2011.
- 758 Jiao, J., Zou, H., Jia, Y., and Wang, N.: Research progress on the effects of soil erosion on vegetation,
759 *Acta Ecologica Sinica*, 29, 85-91, 2009.
- 760 Kéfi, S., van Baalen, M., Rietkerk, M., and Loreau, M.: Evolution of local facilitation in arid ecosystems,
761 *Am Nat*, 172, E1-E17, 2008.
- 762 Kirkby, M.J.: Modelling water erosion processes, in: *Soil Erosion*, Kirkby, M.J. and Morgan, R.P.C.
763 (Eds.), Wiley, Chichester, UK, 183-216, 1980.
- 764 **Lewis, T.D., Rowan, J.S., Hawes, C., and McKenzie, B.M.: Assessing the significance of soil erosion for**
765 **arable weed seedbank diversity in agro-ecosystems, *Prog Phys Geog*, 37, 622-641, 2013.**
- 766 Ludwig, J.A. and Tongway, D.J.: Spatial-organization of landscapes and its function in semiarid
767 woodlands, Australia, *Landscape Ecol*, 10, 51- 63, 1995.
- 768 MacFadyen, W.A.: Soil and vegetation in British Somaliland, *Nature*, 165, 121, 1950.
- 769 Martínez-Casasnovas, J.A., Ramos, M.C., and Ribes-Dasi, M.: On site effects of concentrated flow
770 erosion in vineyard fields: some economic implications, *Catena*, 60, 129-146, 2005.
- 771 Mauchamp, A., Montaña, C., Lepart, J., and Rambal, S.: Ecotone dependent recruitment of a desert shrub;
772 *Flourensia cernua*, in vegetation stripes, *Oikos*, 68, 107-116, 1993.
- 773 Montaña, C., Seghier, J. and Cornet, A.: Vegetation dynamics: recruitment and regeneration in two-
774 phase mosaics, in: *Banded vegetation patterning in arid and semiarid environments: ecological*
775 *processes and consequences for management*, Tongway, D.J., Valentin, C. and Seghier, J. (Eds),
776 Springer, New York, USA, 20-31, 2001.
- 777 Moreno-de las Heras, M., Saco, P., Willgoose, G.R., and Tongway, D.: Variations in hydrological
778 connectivity of Australian semiarid landscapes indicate abrupt changes in rainfall-use efficiency of
779 vegetation, *J Geophys Res-Biogeog*, 117, G03009, 2012. DOI: 10.1029/2011JG001839.
- 780 Moreno-de las Heras, M., Saco, P., Willgoose, G., and Tongway, D.: Assessing landscape structure and
781 pattern fragmentation in semiarid ecosystems using patch-size distributions, *Ecol Appl*, 21, 2793-
782 2805, 2011.
- 783 **Nearing, M.A., Pruski, F.F., and O'Neal, M.R.: Expected climate change impacts on soil erosion rates: a**
784 **review, *J Soil Water Conserv*, 59, 43-50, 2004.**
- 785 Nelson, J.E. and Chew, R.M.: Factors affecting seed reserves in the soil of a Mojave desert ecosystem,
786 Rock Valley, Nye County, Nevada, *Am Midl Nat*, 97, 300-320, 1977.
- 787 Parsons, A.J., Abrahams, A.D., and Wainwright, J.: Responses of interrill runoff and erosion rates to
788 vegetation change in southern Arizona, *Geomorphology*, 14, 311-317, 1996.
- 789 Parsons, A.J., Wainwright, J., and Abrahams, A.D.: Tracing sediment movement in interrill overland flow
790 on a semi-arid grassland hillslope using magnetic susceptibility. *Earth Surf Proc Land*, 18, 721-732,
791 1993.
- 792 Parsons, A.J., Abrahams, A.D., and Luk, S.-K.: Size characteristics of sediment in interrill overland flow
793 on a semiarid hillslope, southern California, *Earth Surf Proc Land*, 16, 143-152, 1991.

- 794 Peart, M.H. and Clifford, H.T.: The influence of diaspore morphology and soil surface properties on the
795 distribution of grasses, *J Ecol*, 75, 569-576, 1987.
- 796 Peco, B., Ortega, M., and Levassor, C.: Similarity between seed bank and vegetation in Mediterranean
797 grassland: a predictive model, *J Veg Sci*, 9, 815-828, 1998.
- 798 Poesen, J. and Savat, J.: Particle-size separation during erosion by splash and runoff, in: *Assesment of*
799 *Erosion*, de Boodt, M. and Gabriels, D. (Eds.), Wiley, Chichester, UK, 427-439, 1980.
- 800 Porqueddu, C., Re, G.A., Sanna, F., Piluzza, G., Sulas, L., Franca, A., and Bullita, S.: Exploitation of
801 annual and perennial herbaceous species for the rehabilitation of a sand quarry in a Mediterranean
802 environment. *Land Degrad Dev*, 2013, DOI:10.1002/ldr.2235.
- 803 Pueyo, Y., Kéfi, S., Alados, C.L., and Rietkerk, M.: Dispersal strategies and spatial organization of
804 vegetation in arid ecosystems, *Oikos*, 117, 1522-1532, 2008.
- 805 Puigdefábregas, J.: The role of vegetation patterns in structuring runoff and sediment fluxes in drylands,
806 *Earth Surf Proc Land*, 30, 133-147, 2005.
- 807 Puigdefábregas, J. and Sánchez, G. Geomorphological implications of vegetation patchiness on semi-arid
808 slopes, in: *Advances in Hillslope Processes*, Anderson, M.G. and Brooks, S.M. (Eds.), Wiley,
809 Chichester, UK, 1027-1060, 1996.
- 810 Puttock, A., Macleod, C.J.A., Bol, R., Sessford, P., Dungait, J., and Brazier, R.E.: Changes in ecosystem
811 structure, function and hydrological connectivity control water, soil and carbon losses in semi-arid
812 grass to woody vegetation transitions, *Earth Surf Proc Land*, 38, 1602-1611, 2013.
- 813 Reichman, O.J.: Spatial and temporal variation of seed distributions in Sonoran desert soils, *J. Biogeogr.*
814 11, 1-11, 1984.
- 815 Rey, F., Isselin-Nondedeu, F., and Bédécarrats, A.: Vegetation dynamics on sediment deposits upstream
816 of bioengineering works in mountainous marly gullies in a Mediterranean climate (Southern Alps,
817 France), *Plant Soil*, 278, 149-158, 2005.
- 818 Reynolds, J.F., Stafford Smith, D.M., Lambin, E.F., Turner, B.L., Mortimore, M., Batterbury, S.P.J.,
819 Downing, T.E., Dowlatabadi, H., Fernandez, R.b.J., Herrick, J.E., Huber-Sannwald, E., Jiang, H.,
820 Leemans, R., Lynam, T., Maestre, F.T., Ayarza, M., and Walker, B. Global desertification: Building
821 a science for dryland development, *Science*, 316, 847-851, 2007.
- 822 Rietkerk, M., Dekker, S.C., de Ruiter, P.C., and van de Koppel, J.: Self-organized patchiness and
823 catastrophic shifts in ecosystems, *Science*, 305, 1926-1929, 2004.
- 824 Saco, P.M., Willgoose, G.R., and Hancock, G.R.: Eco-geomorphology of banded vegetation patterns in
825 arid and semi-arid regions, *Hydrol Earth Syst Sci*, 11, 1717-1730, 2007.
- 826 Schlesinger, W.H., Reynolds, J.F., Cunningham, G.L., Huenneke, L.F., Jarrell, W.M., Virginia, R.A., and
827 Whitford, W.G.: Biological feedbacks in global desertification, *Science*, 247, 1043-1048, 1990.
- 828 Schupp, E.W.: Seed-seedling conflicts, habitat choice, and patterns of plant recruitment. *Am J Bot*, 82,
829 399-409, 1995.
- 830 Schurr, F.M., Bossdorf, O., Milton, S.J., and Schumacher, J.: Spatial pattern formation in semi-arid
831 shrubland: a priori predicted versus observed pattern characteristics, *Plant Ecol*, 173, 271-282, 2004.
- 832 Seghieri, J., Galle, S, Rajot, J.L., and Ehrmann, M.: Relationships between soil moisture and growth of
833 herbaceous plants in a natural vegetation mosaic in Niger, *J Arid Environ*, 36: 87-102, 1997.
- 834 Siewert, W. and Tielborger, K.: Dispersal-dormancy relationships in annual plants: putting model
835 predictions to the test, *Am Nat*, 176, 490-500, 2010.
- 836 Specht, R.L. and Specht, A.: Global warming: predicted effects on structure and species richness of
837 Mediterranean ecosystems in southern Australia, in: *Time scales of Biological Responses to Water*
838 *Constraints*, Roy, J., Aronson, J., and Di Castri, F. (Eds), SPB Academic Publishing, Amsterdam,
839 The Netherlands, 215-237, 1995.
- 840 Thiéry, J., d'Herbès, J.M., and Valentin, C.: A model simulating the genesis of banding patterns in Niger,
841 *J Ecol*, 83, 497-507, 1995.
- 842 Thompson, K., Bond, S.R., and Hodgson, J.G.: Seed size and shape predict persistence in soil, *Funct*
843 *Ecol*, 7, 236-241, 1993.
- 844 Thompson, S.E., Assouline, S., Chen, L., Trahktenbrot, A., Svoray, T., and Katul, G.: Secondary
845 dispersal driven by overland flow in drylands: Review and mechanistic model development.
846 *Movement Ecology*, 2, 1-13, 2014.
- 847 Tongway, D. J., and Ludwig, J.A.: Theories on the origins, maintenance, dynamics and functioning of
848 banded landscapes, in: *Banded vegetation patterning in arid and semiarid environments: ecological*
849 *processes and consequences for management*, Tongway, D.J., Valentin, C., and Seghieri, J. (Eds),
850 Springer, New York, USA, 20-31, 2001.
- 851 Tormo, J., Bochet, E., and García-Fayos, P.: Roadslope revegetation in semiarid Mediterranean
852 environments. Part II: topsoiling, species selection and hydroseeding, *Restor Ecol*, 15, 97-102, 2007.

Con formato: Inglés (Estados Unidos)

Con formato: Inglés (Estados Unidos)

- 853 Traba, J., Azcárate, F.M., and Peco, B.: From what depth do seeds emerge? A soil seed bank experiment
 854 with Mediterranean grassland species, *Seed Sci Res*, 14, 297-303, 2004.
- 855 Traba, J., Azcárate, F.M., and Peco, B.: The fate of seeds in Mediterranean soil seed banks in relation to
 856 their traits, *J Veg Sci*, 17, 5-10, 2006.
- 857 Tsuyuzaki, S. and Haruki, M.: Effects of microtopography and erosion on seedling colonisation and
 858 survival in the volcano Usu, northern Japan, after the 1977–78 eruptions, *Land Degrad Dev*, 19, 233-
 859 241, 2008.
- 860 Turnbull, L., Wilcox, B.P., Belnap, J., Ravi, S., D’Odorico, P., Childers, D., Gwenzi, W., Okin, G.,
 861 Wainwright, J., Caylor, K.K., and Sankey, T. Understanding the role of ecohydrological feedbacks in
 862 ecosystem state change in drylands, *Ecohydrology*, 5, 174-183, 2011.
- 863 Turnbull, L., Wainwright, J., and Brazier, R.E.: Biotic and abiotic changes in ecosystem structure over a
 864 shrub-encroachment gradient in the southwestern USA, *Ecosystems*, 13, 1239–1255, 2010.
- 865 Turnbull, L., Wainwright, J., and Brazier, R.E.: A conceptual framework for understanding semi-arid land
 866 degradation: ecohydrological interactions across multiple-space and time scales. *Ecohydrology*, 1,
 867 23–34, 2008.
- 868 Valentin, C., d’Herbès, J.M., and Poesen, J. Soil and water components of banded vegetation patterns,
 869 *Catena*, 37, 1-24, 1999.
- 870 Valladares, F. and Gianoli, E.: How much ecology do we need to know to restore Mediterranean
 871 ecosystems?, *Restor Ecol*, 15, 363-368, 2007.
- 872 Vander Wall, S., Forget, P., Lambert, J., and Hulme, P.: Seed fate pathways: filling the gap between
 873 parent and offspring, in: *Seed Fate. Predation, Dispersal and Seedling Establishment*, Forget, P.,
 874 Lambert, J., Hulme, P., and Vander Wall, S. (Eds.), Cabi Publishing, UK, 1-8, 2002.
- 875 Venable, L., Flores-Martínez, A., Muller-Landau, H.C., Barron-Gafford, G., and Becerra, J.X.: Seed
 876 dispersal of desert annuals, *Ecology*, 89, 2218-2227, 2008.
- 877 Wainwright, J.: Infiltration, runoff and erosion characteristics of agricultural land in extreme storm event,
 878 SE France, *Catena*, 26, 27–47, 1996.
- 879 Wainwright, J., Parsons, A.J., and Abrahams, A.D.: Plot-scale studies of vegetation, overland flow and
 880 erosion interactions: case studies from Arizona and New Mexico, *Hydrol Processes*, 14, 2921–2943,
 881 2000.
- 882 Wang, D., Jiao, J., Lei, D., Wang, N., Du, H., and Jia, Y.: Effects of seed morphology on seed removal
 883 and plant distribution in the Chinese hill-gully Loess Plateau region, *Catena*, 104, 144-152, 2013.
- 884 Wang, N., Jiao, J-Y., Lei, D., Chen, Y., and Wang, D.L.: Effect of rainfall erosion: seedling damage and
 885 establishment problems, *Land Degrad Dev*, DOI: 10.1002/ldr.2183, 2012.
- 886 Wilcox, B.P., Breshears, D.D., and Allen, C.D.: Ecohydrology of a resource-conserving semiarid
 887 woodland: Effects of scale and disturbance, *Ecol Monogr*, 73, 223 – 239, 2003.
- 888 Winkelmolen, A.M.: Rollability, a functional shape property of sand grains. *J Sediment Petrol*, 41, 703-
 889 714, 1971.

Eliminado: ¶

Eliminado: ¶

Traba, J., Azcárate, F.M., and Peco, B.: The fate of seeds in Mediterranean soil seed banks in relation to their traits, *J Veg Sci*, 17, 5-10, 2006.¶

Tsuyuzaki, S. and Haruki, M.: Effects of microtopography and erosion on seedling colonisation and survival in the volcano Usu, northern Japan, after the 1977–78 eruptions, *Land Degrad Dev*, 19, 233-241, 2008.

Table 1. Overview of experimental studies quantifying seed losses and seed movements by overland flow. Papers are listed chronologically.

Authors	Location	System	Rainfall characteristics	Scale	Measured variables	Studied factors	Main results
García-Fayos and Recatalà 1992	Alicante (Spain)	Semiarid Badlands	Natural rainfall 1 year (5 rainfall events)	Small catchments aprox.900 m ²	Seed balance between seed inputs (primary dispersal) and seed outputs (erosion)		Positive seed balance Evidences of seed losses outside the catchments: 6- to 20-fold more seeds in the sediment traps at the outlets of catchments than in the regolith Evidences of seed redistribution on slopes: spatial gradient of seed density along the slope
García-Fayos et al. 1995	Alicante (Spain)	Semiarid Badlands	-Natural rainfall 2 years -Simulated rainfall 55 mm/h, (40 and 110 min) and 45 mm/h, (40min)	Small catchments 0.24 m ² field plots 3 m ² field plots	Natural rainfall: Seed balance between seed inputs (primary dispersal) and seed outputs (erosion) as % of the soil seed bank Simulated rainfall: % seed losses	Slope angle, length, rainfall duration	Natural rainfall -Positive seed balance -Annual seed losses: 5.6 – 12.6 % Simulated rainfall: Seed losses: < 13 % under simulated rainfall Seed losses increased as slope angle and rain duration increased, and decreased as total transport length increased
García-Fayos and Cerdà 1997	Alicante (Spain)	Semiarid Badlands	Simulated rainfall 55 mm/h, 22 min	0.24 m ² field plot (22-55° slope)	% seed losses	10 different species	Significant exponential relation between seed loss and runoff Total seed loss < 10 % for all replicates Single species seed loss < 25 %
Cerdà and García-Fayos 1997	Alicante (Spain)	Semiarid Badlands	Simulated rainfall 55 mm/h, 40 min	0.24 m ² field plot (2° pediment and 22-55° slopes)	% seed losses	Slope angle	Seed losses: 4 % on slopes in average 23 % in the pediment Seed losses are negatively related to slope angle due to the strategy of seeds against erosion

Cerdà and García-Fayos 2002	Laboratory	-	Simulated rainfall 55 mm/h, 25 min	26 x 26 cm plot (11° slope) no soil	% seed losses	83 species	11 % average seed losses for all experiments
Aerts et al. 2006	Northern Ethiopia	Forest restoration areas	Natural rainfall one rainy season Simulated rainfall 120 mm/h, 10 min	3x3 m ² field plots (8-18° slope)	% seed displacement	Seeds of 1 species (<i>Olea europaea</i>) Slope angle and roughness, Pioneer shrub species as vegetated patches	21-61 % seed movement No significant influence of shrub species, slope angle and roughness on seed movement
Venable et al. 2008	Sonoran desert (Arizona)	Desert		Plots 10-30 m in diameter	Distance of seed displacement	Slope angle, pioneer shrub	Displacement distance < 1 m
Emmerson et al. 2010	Mid-east South- Australia	Chenopod shrubland with scattered trees	Natural rainfall 9 month-period		% of seed displacement Distance of seed displacement	Seeds of 1 local species (<i>Erodiohyllum elderi</i>) Grazing pressure (animal tracks : 0.3m wide and 0.2m deep), slope angle	After 9 months: Low proportion of seeds displaced out of tracks: <10 % Low distances of displacement out of tracks: 1.09 m Tracks increase the rate and distance of displacement Slope angle increased the proportion of seeds moved and the distance of seed displacement
Jiao et al. 2011	Loess Plateau China		Simulated rainfall 50/ 100/ 150 mm/h, 60 min	1 m ² laboratory plots filled with soil from the field site (10/15/20/25° slope)	% seed losses % seed displacement Distance of seed displacement	16 different local species	Seed losses: 0 % at 50 mm/h rainfall intensity, 26-33 % at 100 mm/h rainfall intensity, 59-67 % at 150 mm/h rainfall intensity Average seed displacement distance: 6.2 cm maximum distance at 50 mm/h, 31.5 cm at 100 mm/h and 42.0 cm at 150 mm/h.
Han et al. 2011	Loess Plateau China		Simulated rainfall 50/ 100/ 150 mm/h, 60 min	1 m ² laboratory plots filled with soil from the field site (10/15/20/25° slope)	% seed losses % seed displacement Distance of seed displacement	16 different local species Rainfall intensity, Slope angle	Seed displacement (SD) and seed losses (SL): 0 % SD and 30-45 % SL at 50 mm/h rainfall intensity 46.9 % SD and 32.6 % SL at 100 mm/h 20.4 % SD and 66.0 % SL at 150 mm/h Significant influence of rainfall intensity on seed loss No influence of slope angle on seed loss at a same

						rainfall intensity
Wang et al. 2013	Loess Plateau China	Simulated rainfall 120mm/h, 30 min	1m ² laboratory plots filled with soil from the field site (20° slope)	Seed losses, Seed displacement ratio (seed displaced/ total seeds used)*100 Distance of seed displacement	60 plant species	Seed losses varied among species: 0 - 100% Seed displacement ratio: 3.3 to 100% Average seed displacement distances: 3.2 - 157.5cm

Figure captions

Figure 1. Temporal evolution of the total number of papers on seed fate and dispersal in drylands published between 1974 and 2013, along with the evolution of the relative number of papers focusing on secondary seed dispersal. Data were obtained from online key-word searches with Scopus database using the “All Document Type” option, date range from 1974-2013 and the following formulae in Topics: (a) (“dispersal” or “seed fate” and “seed”) and (arid or semiarid or semi-arid or dryland or “patchy vegetation” or “patchy ecosystem” or patchiness or mosaic or desert)” for seed fate studies in general; (b) (“dispersal” or “seed fate” and “seed”) and (arid or semiarid or semi-arid or dryland or “patchy vegetation” or “patchy ecosystem” or patchiness or mosaic or desert) and (“secondary dispersal” or “secondary seed dispersal” or “seed removal” or “seed movement” or “secondary seed movement” or “secondary movement” or “secondary process” or “post dispersal” or “post-dispersal” or “seed bank” or “seedbank”)) for secondary seed dispersal studies.

Figure 2. Temporal evolution of the total number of papers on secondary seed dispersal in drylands published between 1974 and 2013, along with the total number of papers for the same time period specifically addressing secondary dispersal by animals, wind and overland flow. Data were obtained from online key-word searches with Scopus database using the “All Document Type” option, date range from 1974 until 2013 and the following formulae in Topics: (“dispersal” or “seed fate” and “seed”) and (arid or semiarid or semi-arid or dryland or “patchy vegetation” or “patchy ecosystem” or patchiness or mosaic or desert) and (“secondary dispersal” or “secondary seed dispersal” or “seed removal” or “seed movement” or “secondary seed movement” or “secondary movement” or “secondary process” or “post dispersal” or “post-dispersal” or “seed bank” or “seedbank”)), adding:

(a) “and (runoff or run-off or erosion or “water transport” or “overland flow”))” for overland flow;

(b) “and (wind or eolian)” for wind;

(c) “and (“animal*” or biotic or ants or birds or rodents)” for animals.

Figure 3. Total number of papers on secondary dispersal in drylands published between 1974 and 2013 and classified by Journal Categories. The graph underlines the anecdotal number of papers (2) published in soil science related Journals (grey cone). Papers were assigned to a single main category even though in Scopus they could belong to several categories at a time. N=162.

Papers were obtained from online key-word searches with Scopus using the “All Document type” option with the following formula: (“dispersal” or “seed fate” and “seed”) and (arid or semiarid or semi-arid or dryland or “patchy vegetation” or “patchy ecosystem” or patchiness or mosaic or desert) and (“secondary dispersal” or “secondary seed dispersal” or “seed removal” or “seed movement” or “secondary seed movement” or “secondary movement” or “secondary process” or “post dispersal” or “post-dispersal” or “seed bank” or “seedbank”)) in Topics for period 1974-2013. From the 165 retrieved papers plotted in Figure 2, three could not be classified as information about Journal Category was lacking in Scopus.

Figure 4. Conceptual model of seed fate in and on the soil (grey area). Rectangles represent seed states, dotted arrows indicate transitions between seed states and processes are written in italics. Grey arrows indicate seed movements and processes related to movement are in bold. After Schafer & Chilcote (1970), Fenner (1985), Chambers & Mac Mahon (1994), Van der Wall et al. (2002). The term “seed” used throughout the model and the text represents the diaspore or unit of dispersal (seed with surrounding dispersal structures).

Figure 5. Schematic figure of seed fate in overland flow at the (A) slope scale and (B) patch scale (patch-to-patch transmission of seeds). The figure represents how the spatial pattern of the vegetation influences seed distribution and seed fate and how, in turn, seed fate influences the origin and maintenance of patches in arid and semiarid patchy ecosystems.

Eliminado: a

Eliminado: b