

1 Can we manipulate root system architecture to control soil  
2 erosion?

3 Anne Ola<sup>1</sup>, Ian C. Dodd<sup>1</sup> and John N. Quinton<sup>1\*</sup>

4 [1] Lancaster Environment Centre, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YQ, United  
5 Kingdom

6 \*corresponding author J.Quinton@lancaster.ac.uk

7 **Abstract**

8 Soil erosion is a major threat to soil functioning. The use of vegetation to control erosion has  
9 long been a topic for research. Much of this research has focused on the above ground  
10 properties of plants, demonstrating the important role that canopy structure and cover plays in  
11 the reduction of water erosion processes. Less attention has been paid to plant roots. Plant  
12 roots are a crucial yet under-researched factor for reducing water erosion through their ability  
13 to alter soil properties, such as aggregate stability, hydraulic function and shear strength.  
14 However, there have been few attempts to specifically manipulate plant root system  
15 properties to reduce soil erosion. Therefore, this review aims to explore the effects that plant  
16 roots have on soil erosion and hydrological processes, and how plant root architecture might  
17 be manipulated to enhance its erosion control properties. We demonstrate the importance of  
18 root system architecture for the control of soil erosion. We also show that some plant species  
19 respond to nutrient enriched patches by increasing lateral root proliferation. The erosional  
20 response to root proliferation will depend upon its location: at the soil surface dense mats of  
21 roots may reduce soil erodibility but block soil pores thereby limiting infiltration, enhancing  
22 runoff. Additionally, in nutrient deprived regions, root hair development may be stimulated

1 and larger amounts of root exudates released, thereby improving aggregate stability and  
2 decreasing erodibility. Utilising nutrient placement at specific depths may represent a  
3 potentially new, easily implemented, management strategy on nutrient poor agricultural land  
4 or constructed slopes to control erosion, and further research in this area is needed.

## 5 **1.Introduction**

6 Soil erosion by water is a serious environmental problem representing a much greater threat to  
7 agricultural production than soil erosion by wind (Lal, 2010). Approximately 430 million ha  
8 of arable land, or 30% of the globally available land for agricultural production, has been  
9 degraded by water erosion and a further 56% is at risk (Jankauskas *et al.*, 2008). The effect of  
10 vegetation on reducing soil erosion is well known. Plants intercept rainfall, some is stored in  
11 the canopy with the remainder evaporating or reaching the soil surface either directly as  
12 throughfall, or indirectly through stem flow or leaf drainage (Stocking and Elwell, 1976;  
13 Puigdefábregas, 2005). Water reaching the soil surface may be stored in small depressions on  
14 the soil surface or infiltrate into the soil. The remainder may move downhill as overland flow,  
15 entraining soil particles and transporting them, and may also concentrate to form rills and  
16 gullies. There are a number of factors controlling erosion, namely the erosivity of the eroding  
17 agent, slope angle, the nature of the plant cover and the erodibility of the soil (Morgan, 1986).  
18 Erosion may result in on-site soil degradation reducing the soil's productivity and water  
19 storage capacity, due to changes in soil structure, soil depth and losses of nutrients and  
20 organic matter (OM). This may lead to significant losses of crop yield (Lal, 2001; Pimentel,  
21 2006; Jankauskas *et al.*, 2008), posing a threat to food security or limiting the production of  
22 renewable biotic resources (Pimentel, 2006; Jankauskas *et al.*, 2008). Off-site problems  
23 associated with downstream sedimentation include flooding, pollution, negative effects on  
24 biodiversity, as well as the loss of reservoir storage (Pimentel and Kounang, 1998; Lal, 2001;  
25 Pimentel, 2006). In the UK, the annual costs of both on-site and off-site problems were

1 recently estimated to range between £248 and £469 million (Posthumus *et al.*, 2013). Hence,  
2 there is a need to stabilize soils and preserve this crucial resource.

3 The importance of vegetation cover to control erosion has been demonstrated by many  
4 studies. Both linear and exponential decreases in erosion rates associated with vegetation  
5 cover have been observed, as the nature of the relationship varies for canopy and ground  
6 covers, or inter-rill and rill erosion (Boer and Puidgefábregas, 2005).. In Montana and Utah,  
7 for example, overland flow erosion rates increased ca. 200 times in response to a decrease in  
8 ground cover from 100% to less than 1% (Trimble and Mendel, 1995). A minimum of 10%  
9 plant cover was required to significantly reduce erosion rates on a semi-arid hillslope in  
10 Arizona (Abrahams *et al.*,1988), however, the magnitude of the response ultimately depends  
11 on vegetation type and species (Bochet *et al.*, 2006). Positive effects of the aerial biomass in  
12 controlling erosion are generally attributed to reductions in the kinetic energy of raindrops  
13 and reduced overland flow velocities (Stocking and Elwell, 1976; Puigdefábregas, 2005).  
14 Furthermore, vegetation covers modify intrinsic soil properties determining a soil's erodibility  
15 (Gyssels *et al.*, 2005) creating a microclimate and supplying OM, that affect the activity of  
16 microorganisms, and therefore nutrient availability, resulting in a positive feedback on plant  
17 productivity. Both additional OM as well as microbial and fungal secretions enhance the  
18 formation of stable aggregates (Puidgefábregas, 2005, Vásquez-Méndez *et al.*, 2010), which  
19 affect hydraulic conductivity and, hence, water storage capacity (Puidgefábregas, 2005) and  
20 may increase soil shear strength (Tengbeh, 1993; De Baets *et al*, 2008).

21 Compared to studies on above ground plant properties and soil erosion, the effects of below  
22 ground biomass have received relatively little attention. However, it is clear that the reduction  
23 in soil loss due to vegetation results from the combined effects of the above and below ground  
24 biomass (Gyssels and Poesen, 2003). Concentrated flow erosion rates were reduced to almost  
25 zero within the 0-10% soil cross-sectional occupation by grass roots, but decreased only by

1 25-50% for the same increase in aerial cover (De Baets *et al.*, 2006). Furthermore, a rainfall  
2 simulation experiment conducted 27 weeks after ryegrass (*Lolium perenne*) was sown in  
3 erosion pans demonstrated (by removal of the above ground material) that the below ground  
4 material of this species accounted for 90% of the decrease in soil detachment (Zhou and  
5 Shangguan, 2007).

6 In this paper we take an interdisciplinary view of the plant root and its interaction with the  
7 soil, in line with the interdisciplinary nature of this journal (Brevik *et al.*, 2015), and review the  
8 literature concerning the effects of roots on soil properties determining the resistance of soil  
9 to water erosion (concentrated and sheet flow) with emphasis on root system architecture  
10 (RSA). We then explore the factors influencing RSA especially lateral root (LR) growth, and  
11 finally the potential of fertilizer applications to stimulate LR proliferation, and thus form the  
12 basis for a soil erosion control method, will be discussed.

## 13 **2.The effects of roots on soil erodibility**

14 Erodibility is the result of various mechanical, adhesive and cohesive bonding forces acting  
15 within the soil matrix (Knapen *et al.*, 2007) and should be regarded as a ‘summation of a  
16 highly complex response pattern, strongly influenced by intrinsic soil characteristics and  
17 extrinsic variables’ (Bryan, 2000). The erosion response may be influenced by any soil  
18 property, but will be dominated by shear strength, aggregate stability and hydraulic function  
19 (Bryan, 2000). Roots alter the erodibility of a soil through their effect on these soil properties  
20 in a number of ways (Figure 1). Firstly, roots have a high tensile strength (Gyssels *et al.*,  
21 2005; De Baets *et al.*, 2008) providing up to 100% of the cohesive strength of a root  
22 permeated soil (Hales *et al.*, 2009), thus increasing soil shear strength. The additional tensile  
23 strength associated with roots is responsible for the transfer of shear stresses via tensile  
24 resistance or interface friction within the soil-root matrix (Prosser *et al.*, 1995, De Baets *et al.*,

1 2008). There was a positive linear relationship between the cross-sectional area of barley  
2 (*Hordeum vulgare*) roots at the shear plane and, subsequent increases in soil shear strength in  
3 a silty clay loam soil (Waldron, 1977). In ryegrass, increasing root densities from  $0.20 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$   
4 to  $1.80 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$  also increased strength from 1 kPa to 5 kPa in a sandy clay loam (Tengbeh,  
5 1993). Hence, the presence of roots considerably increases shear strength.

6 Secondly, roots prevent sediment transport by retaining soil particles (De Baets *et al.* 2006)  
7 and increasing the number of stable aggregates, due to their enmeshing effect (Haynes and  
8 Beare, 1997), which is also true for fungal hyphae (Haynes and Beare, 1997; Degens, 1997;  
9 Moreno-Espíndola *et al.* 2007), and the release of various organic and inorganic binding  
10 agents (Amezketá, 1999). Root exudates such as mucilage are considered the main  
11 mechanism by which plant roots enhance aggregate stability (Morel *et al.*, 1991; Moreno-  
12 Espíndola *et al.* 2007). Root mucilage expands under wet conditions covering soil particles,  
13 while subsequent drying leads to the contraction of mucilage, pulling these soil particles  
14 tightly together to form a rhizosheath, and thereby reorienting clay particles parallel to the  
15 axis of the root (Oades, 1984; Watt *et al.*, 1994; Amezketá, 1999; McCully, 1999). Moreover,  
16 root exudates are associated with the release of polyvalent cations that form strong bonds  
17 between organic molecules and clays (Oades, 1984; Pojasok and Kay, 1990; Amezketá,  
18 1999). Increasing amounts of ions in solution after exudates were added limit clay dispersion  
19 and significantly increase aggregate stability (Pojasok and Kay, 1990). Decaying roots and  
20 fungal hyphae also represent a source of OM (Oades, 1984; Haynes and Beare, 1997;  
21 Amezketá, 1999) that contributes to aggregate stability. Thus aggregate stability is enhanced  
22 by biological activity (both plant and fungal) within the soil.

23 Root exudates represent 5 to 21% of a plant's photosynthetically fixed carbon (C) (Walker *et*  
24 *al.*, 2003) serving as a crucial energy source for microorganisms (Haynes and Beare, 1997;  
25 Amezketá, 1999). Both fungal and bacterial extracellular polymeric substances contribute to

1 the cementation of aggregates, and, thus enhance aggregate persistence (Oades, 1984; Morel  
2 *et al.*, 1991; Watt *et al.*, 1994; Haynes and Beare, 1997; Bryan, 2000). However, the effect of  
3 roots on aggregate stability is species specific (Haynes and Beare, 1997; Amezketa, 1999) due  
4 to differences in root morphology (Pohl *et al.*, 2009), turnover rates (Stokes *et al.*, 2009), the  
5 quantity and chemical composition of the root exudates and the influence of differences in  
6 root exudates on microbial activity (Haynes and Beare, 1997, Bertin *et al.*, 2003). Barley  
7 roots increased aggregate stability (Haynes and Beare, 1997), whilst there is contradicting  
8 evidence about the effects of roots of maize (*Zea mays*). Root mucilage of maize reportedly  
9 increased aggregation (Morel *et al.*, 1991), but the release of chelating agents, such as organic  
10 acids (which destroy iron and aluminium bonds with OM) by maize decreased aggregate  
11 stability (Oades, 1984). These contrasting results may be attributed to genotypic variation in  
12 the chemistry of the root exudates. For example, within different barley genotypes, three  
13 structural variations of mugineic acid (an organic ligand) have been found (Bertin *et al.*,  
14 2003). In addition, some organic compounds released by roots and microorganisms may also  
15 induce water repellency depending on soil matric potential and the number of wetting and  
16 drying cycles undergone (Hallett *et al.*, 2003). However, OM and aggregate stability are  
17 crucial in the formation of macropores, which reduce bulk density and facilitate gaseous  
18 diffusion and improve infiltration rates (Gyssels and Poesen, 2003). Thus, the effects of root  
19 exudates vary between species and depend on their composition.

20 Roots may also provide soils with additional surface roughness enhancing infiltration rates  
21 (De Baets *et al.* 2006), while water uptake through roots (Macleod *et al.*, 2007) and the  
22 creation of continuous pore spaces increase the infiltration capacity, reducing surface runoff  
23 (Bryan, 2000; Bronick and Lal, 2005; Macleod *et al.*, 2007). Quinton *et al.* (2002) found a  
24 positive correlation between infiltration rates and root density for needle grass (*Stipa*  
25 *tenacissima*) and, to a lesser extent, for downy plantain (*Plantago albicans*), while unclear

1 results were obtained for albaida (*Anthyllis cytisoides*) and white wormwood (*Artemisia*  
2 *herba-alba*). Under alfalfa (*Medicago sativa*), 60% of all flow paths are associated with the  
3 roots or the channels of decomposed roots allowing water to rapidly percolate through the soil  
4 matrix (Stokes *et al.* 2009). Shallow, fibrous root systems and rhizomatous mats of ryegrass  
5 and common bent grass (*Agrostis capillaris*), respectively, resulted in a low saturated  
6 hydraulic conductivity (Morgan *et al.*, 1995). Several authors (Mitchell *et al.*, 1995; Meek *et*  
7 *al.*, 1989; Archer *et al.*, 2002; Devitt and Smith, 2002) suggest that living roots occupy  
8 available macropores for flow pathways, and enhance infiltration rates over time, as a result  
9 of channels created by decaying roots. Infiltration rates in a sandy loam, for instance, tripled  
10 within three years of alfalfa cultivation (Meek *et al.*, 1989) and significantly increased  
11 infiltration rates were recorded for the last half of the growing season, and after harvest, of a  
12 maize crop (Archer *et al.*, 2002). This is also supported by observations that the root effect of  
13 ryegrass on increasing infiltration rates (thus decreasing runoff) increased with time (Zhou  
14 and Shangguan, 2007). Moreover, the effects associated with cyclic shrinking-expanding of  
15 roots in accordance with water availability also created flow pathways over time (Archer *et*  
16 *al.*, 2002). However, the effect of roots on flow pathways, and thus infiltration rates, differed  
17 under a number of Mediterranean species, due to differences in root morphology (Quinton *et*  
18 *al.*, 2002), and turnover rates, as a result of differences in root diameter and chemical  
19 composition (Stokes *et al.*, 2009). Thus, not only the presence of roots, but their physical  
20 arrangement within the soil, alters soil hydraulic properties.

21 A frequently used root parameter, that sufficiently describes the effectiveness of a species to  
22 control concentrated flow erosion rates (Burylo *et al.*, 2012), is root length density (RLD).  
23 RLD is the total length of the roots divided by the volume of the root permeated soil sample  
24 (De Baets *et al.*, 2006), thus providing information about the occupation of soil by roots  
25 (Bauhus and Messier, 1999; De Baets *et al.*, 2006, De Baets *et al.*, 2007). Under cereal and

1 grass plants in the loess belt of Belgium, concentrated flow erosion rates exponentially  
2 decreased with a linear increase in RLD (Gyssels and Poesen, 2003). Similar results were  
3 obtained by Mamo and Bubenzer (2001a, b) between erosion rates of a silt loam soil  
4 subjected to concentrated flow and RLD in maize and soybean (*Glycine max*), which reduced  
5 detachment rates by 50% compared to fallow soils. A similar relation exists between RLD of  
6 barley and detachment rates (De Baets *et al.*, 2006). However, increasing RLD either affects  
7 soil shear strength positively (Ghidey and Alberts, 1997; Mamo and Bubenzer, 2001a, b), or  
8 not at all, depending on species and soil type (Pierret *et al.*, 2007). Furthermore, higher RLDs  
9 enhance soil aggregation in crop species (Haynes and Beare, 1997) and when comparing  
10 grass, forb and legume species from a natural grassland ecosystem (Rilling *et al.*, 2002).  
11 However, the ability of roots to reinforce a soil is not only determined by root characteristics  
12 such as RLD, but also their distribution within the soil.

### 13 **3.Root system architecture and its manipulation**

14 RSA is the three-dimensional deployment of roots (Linkohr *et al.*, 2002; Basu *et al.*, 2011). In  
15 eudicots, RSA is mainly determined by the extent and direction of root tip growth and the  
16 positioning and frequency of LRs (Jones and Ljung, 2012). Therefore, in this review  
17 ‘manipulating RSA’ refers to alterations being made to the spatial configuration of the roots  
18 of an individual plant in respect of LR growth (i.e. initiation, elongation, diameter, branching)  
19 by stimulating proliferation of these roots at certain depths. RSA is constitutively influenced  
20 by genetic factors (Smucker, 1993; Malamy, 2005; Stokes *et al.*, 2009), as demonstrated by  
21 mutants of maize lacking different root classes (Malamy, 2005). Mature cereal root systems  
22 consist mostly of coarse (seminal – seed derived, or nodal – shoot derived) roots and fine  
23 (lateral) roots ( $\emptyset < 1\text{mm}$ ) (LRs), which often develop root hairs (McCully, 1999) from the  
24 trichoblasts in the meristematic zone (Gilroy & Jones, 2000). Although LRs are the major  
25 sites of water and nutrient uptake, coarse roots are mainly responsible for anchorage, the



1 storage of nutrients, water and C, as well as the penetration of hard soils and deep horizons  
2 (Guerrero-Campo *et al.* 2006). LRs tend to have greater growth rates than other roots  
3 (Guerrero-Campo *et al.*, 2006; Stokes *et al.*, 2009) and account for ca. 90-98% of the total  
4 root length of a root system (Engineer and Kranz, 2007; Pohl *et al.*, 2009). Hence, total root  
5 length is mainly determined by the density of LRs (Guerrero-Campo *et al.*, 2006; De Baets *et*  
6 *al.*, 2007; Pierret *et al.*, 2007). Thus RLD significantly increased with the percentage of LRs  
7 (Burylo *et al.*, 2012), and decreased with increasing root diameters (Pohl *et al.*, 2009).

8 Moreover, different types of root system are often distinguished based on the presence of a  
9 primary root representing a single dominant axis with varying degrees of LR development,  
10 which is characteristic for primary or tap root systems (Fitter, 1987), whereas root systems  
11 lacking a primary root are referred to as a fibrous root system (De Baets *et al.*, 2007). Only a  
12 few studies have compared the effect of these different root systems on soil erosion rates, with  
13 fibrous root systems being more effective in reinforcing soils against concentrated flow than  
14 tap root systems with similar root mass (De Baets *et al.*, 2007). In contrast, tap rooting species  
15 increase saturated hydraulic conductivity, which tends to be low under fibrous root systems  
16 (Archer *et al.*, 2002; Quinton *et al.*, 2002). These observations can be explained by the larger  
17 number of LRs and greater root length densities (RLD) associated with fibrous root systems  
18 compared to tap root systems (De Baets *et al.*, 2007).

19 Macleod *et al.* (2007) propose specific genetic selection and breeding for root traits, such as  
20 rooting depth, to improve soil hydraulic function. However, these root traits are under  
21 complex genetic control (Zhu *et al.*, 2005; Macleod *et al.*, 2007) even though alleles  
22 determining, for example, LR primordia development in thale cress (*Arabidopsis thaliana*)  
23 (Roycewicz and Malamy, 2014), as well as LR branching or length in maize (Zhu *et al.*,  
24 2005), have been identified. Limited knowledge of the root phenome, the ‘chaotic’ nature of  
25 the interactions among phenes and environmental factors, ultimately determining crop

1 performance and function (Lynch and Brown, 2012), hinder the development of new crop  
2 varieties with altered root traits. Although RSA is genetically constrained, it is highly plastic  
3 in response to environmental cues. This means that genetically identical plants may differ in  
4 root density, growth rate, placement and growth direction (Müller and Schmidt, 2004;  
5 Malamy, 2005), as a result of adaptive responses (López-Bucio *et al.*, 2003; Jones and Ljung,  
6 2012) to the prevailing environmental conditions. The heterogeneous distribution of nutrients  
7 can increase LR length and initiation, as well as coordinate proliferation of LRs in soil regions  
8 where these resources are present (e.g. Fitter, 1987; Smucker, 1993; Stokes *et al.* 2009).  
9 Hence, the localized application of nutrients at prescribed depths and associated LR  
10 proliferation offers an opportunity to manipulate LR distribution within the soil profile,  
11 thereby promoting RSAs that reduce soil erosion.

#### 12 **4.Lateral root proliferation in response to local nutrient availability**

13 The local proliferation of LRs allows the optimal exploitation of locally available nutrient  
14 reserves (Smucker, 1993; Robinson, 1994; Hodge, 2006). Lack of nitrogen (N), as well as  
15 phosphorus (P), often limits growth (Linkohr *et al.*, 2002; López-Bucio *et al.*, 2003). Nitrate  
16 ( $\text{NO}_3^-$ ) is the major source of N for most plants and is, as well as ammonium ( $\text{NH}_4^+$ ), readily  
17 available to plants (Engineer and Kranz, 2007). A series of studies by Drew and co-workers  
18 investigated the response of barley roots to local nutrient enrichment. Although a  
19 heterogeneous distribution of potassium (K) did not affect RSA (Drew, 1975; Robinson,  
20 1994), LR initiation and extension increased within a 4 cm long segment of a seminal root  
21 exposed to 100 times greater concentrations of  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and  $\text{NH}_4^+$  than the remainder of the root  
22 system, where nutrient-limited conditions inhibited LR development (Drew *et al.*, 1973;  
23 Drew, 1975; Drew and Staker 1975) (Figure 2). The same is true for wheat (*Triticum*  
24 *aestivum*) (Drew, 1975; Forde and Lorenzo, 2001) and maize grown in a flowing nutrient  
25 culture whereby two nodal roots were exposed to different  $\text{NO}_3^-$  concentrations revealed

1 similar results (Granato and Raper, 1989). Furthermore, a concentration of 1 mM  $\text{NO}_3^-$   
2 stimulated LR branching and increased LR diameters in both maize and barley (Drew, 1975;  
3 Granato and Raper, 1989), possibly due to increases in stele diameter and the numbers of cells  
4 in the root cortex and stele (Forde and Lorenzo, 2001). When thale cress was grown on  
5 vertical agar plates with a  $\text{NO}_3^-$ -enriched band halfway down the plate, LR lengths increased  
6 2-3 fold, although there was no evidence for enhanced LR initiation (Zhang and Forde, 1998).  
7 However, nutrient solutions containing  $\text{NH}_4^+$  as primary N source lead to higher root  
8 densities and increased root elongation in maize compared to solutions containing  $\text{NO}_3^-$  (Jing  
9 *et al.* 2010). The localized availability of P often also results in increased LR extension  
10 (Drew, 1975; Robinson, 1994) and sometimes increased LR initiation within this zone (Drew,  
11 1975). However, Drew (1975) highlights the importance of the presence of both nutrients, N  
12 and P, in stimulating LR proliferation. In addition, LR proliferation has been reported in  
13 response to organic and inorganic N and P, although the response to the former is determined  
14 by the extent and rate in which mineralization has occurred (Robinson, 1994). Thus LR  
15 proliferation in response to localised nutrient patches is well documented in many species  
16 grown in different artificial (not soil) media.

17 Root proliferation is believed to be triggered partly by shoot-to-root signalling, as the  
18 developmental response to localized increased  $\text{NO}_3^-$  was most pronounced with plants of low  
19 N status (Forde and Lorenzo, 2001; Forde, 2002). High  $\text{NO}_3^-$  levels result in increased auxin  
20 concentration in the LR tip stimulating LR growth, while high  $\text{NH}_4^+$  levels enhance higher  
21 order root branching. The presence of both forms of N results in a complementary response  
22 (Forde, 2002; Jones & Ljung, 2012). However, if  $\text{NO}_3^-$  concentrations are too high, LR  
23 growth tends to be inhibited (Zhang and Forde, 1998; Linkohr *et al.*, 2002), which is mediated  
24 by abscisic acid (López-Bucio *et al.* 2003). A detailed discussion of the molecular

1 mechanisms responsible for LR proliferation in nutrient-rich zones is beyond the scope of this  
2 paper, but the topic has been recently reviewed by Jones and Ljung (2012).

3 However, the growth media used in these studies (agar, hydroponics) do not necessarily  
4 reflect natural conditions and it is important to determine whether such responses occur in  
5 soil. Paradoxically, when wheat plants were grown in soil-filled rhizotrons (1.4 m deep) with  
6 nutrients (both N and P) banded at 0-40 cm or 60-100 cm below the soil surface and the soil  
7 allowed to dry (simulating a terminal drought stress), the greatest RLD detected at 1.4 m  
8 occurred with the surface fertiliser application (Jin *et al.*, 2015). However, fertiliser banding  
9 (stratification) and local placement (patches) can elicit different responses. LRs of thale cress  
10 in a  $\text{NO}_3^-$  enriched patch in a heterogeneous soil were only marginally longer than in the  
11 corresponding patch under homogeneous conditions (Linkohr *et al.* 2002). Nevertheless, LR  
12 proliferation has been observed in the field (Sattelmacher *et al.*, 1993; Robinson, 1994). A  
13 recent study in North China showed that banding  $\text{NH}_4^+$  and P at 10 cm depth resulted in a 23-  
14 30 % increase in total root length and higher RLD at a depth of 0-15cm in maize compared to  
15 broadcast application, or banding of P only while  $\text{NH}_4^+$  was broadcast. Moreover, banding of  
16 both nutrients also increased RLD at a depth of 15-30cm (Jing *et al.*, 2010). However, the  
17 responsiveness of plants to localized nutrient availability varies between different species and  
18 genotypes (Robinson, 1994).

## 19 **5.Manipulating root system architecture with nutrient placement to control** 20 **erosion**

21 Beyond the selection of different plant species, little consideration has been given to the  
22 potential for manipulating RSA for soil erosion control, despite it being known that the  
23 distribution of LRs within the top 50cm of the soil is crucial in determining the effect of roots  
24 on the resistance of soils to concentrated flow erosion (Li *et al.*, 1991). Dense mats of LRs are

1 commonly found at the soil surface (Pierret *et al.*, 2007) and the abundance of roots gradually  
2 declines with increasing soil depth (Quinton *et al.*, 2002; De Baets *et al.*, 2008). However, it  
3 has been argued higher RLDs at deeper soil depths would be particularly beneficial, as this  
4 increases possible water uptake and evapotranspiration rates, thus infiltration rates (Stokes *et*  
5 *al.*, 2009) and would provide reinforcement to deeper soil layers in situations where  
6 concentrated flow erosion is problematic. In addition, longer vertical roots, that increase RLD  
7 at depth, provide conduits to deeper soil layers (Archer *et al.*, 2002; Devitt and Smith, 2002;  
8 Quinton *et al.*, 2002) and directly affect water storage capacity of the effective soil depth  
9 (Macleod *et al.*, 2007; Stokes *et al.*, 2009). Improvements in aggregate stability tend to be  
10 particularly pronounced in, if not spatially limited to, the rhizosphere (Oades, 1994; Foster,  
11 1988; Morel *et al.*, 1991; Haynes and Beare, 1997), so the extent of the root system  
12 determines its effect on soil aggregation (Haynes and Beare, 1997). The effects of roots of the  
13 grasses *Stipa bungeana* and *Bothriochlon ischaemum* on the properties of a Chinese loess soil  
14 (SOM and aggregate stability, especially in large diameter classes) decreased with increasing  
15 depth, as RLD diminished (Li and Li, 2011). The higher sediment load derived from deep soil  
16 horizons associated with the higher susceptibility of these soil horizons to erosional forces  
17 was further enhanced by increasing runoff discharge and slope gradient (Li and Li, 2011) and  
18 was particularly critical during concentrated flow erosion. Furthermore, soil cohesion  
19 provided by roots is also limited to the rooting depth of the vegetation, consequently soil  
20 reinforcement decreases with increasing depth (Gyssels *et al.*, 2005; De Baets *et al.*, 2008).  
21 Although Mediterranean shrubs typically only stabilize the top 50 cm of gully walls and  
22 hillslopes, failures may occur at deeper depths and increases in soil strength depend on the  
23 number of LRs that cross the potential shear plane (Reubens *et al.*, 2007; De Baets *et al.*,  
24 2008).

1 Plants may also respond to heterogeneous nutrient supply with compensatory root growth  
2 (Drew, 1975; Robinson, 1994). Compensatory growth means that proliferation within the N  
3 or P enriched zone compensates, and may be proportional to, the inhibitory effect of the  
4 limited availability of these nutrients on LR development outside this zone (Robinson, 1994).  
5 In this case, soil properties at different soil layers may change accordingly to the proportion of  
6 LRs present within these layers. Reduced LR growth on the soil surface, when nutrients are  
7 only available at deeper depths, could reduce resistance to surface erosion, but could  
8 potentially increase the water storage capacity of a soil, as the number of blocked pores by  
9 LRs at the soil surface would be reduced. Furthermore, although the diameter of LR increases  
10 in nutrient enriched zones (Drew, 1975; Granato and Raper, 1989; Forde and Lorenzo, 2001),  
11 LR proliferation may still increase shear strength locally (De Baets *et al.*, 2008; Loades *et al.*,  
12 2010) and could help to reinforce soils at the shear plane. In addition, aggregate stability may  
13 be improved within the nutrient poor patch, as larger quantities of mucilage may be released  
14 within this zone to mobilise scarcely available P (Bertin *et al.*, 2003). In contrast, Paterson *et*  
15 *al.* (2006) showed that LR proliferation in response to localized availability of  $\text{NO}_3^-$  resulted  
16 only in a locally increased release of root exudates in barley. Compensatory growth may also  
17 enhance root hair development in the nutrient poor zone, and root hairs contribute to soil  
18 aggregation in the rhizosphere and are crucial for rhizosheath development (Hochholdinger *et*  
19 *al.*, 2004; Moreno-Espíndola *et al.*, 2007). Root hair length increased from 0.1-0.2 to 0.7 mm  
20 and density by a factor of 2-4 when spinach (*Spinacia oleracea*), tomato (*Solanum*  
21 *lycopersicum*) and rapeseed (*Brassica napus*) were grown in nutrient solutions with  
22 concentrations of 2  $\mu\text{M}$  P compared to concentrations of 1000  $\mu\text{M}$  P (Foehse and Junk, 1983).  
23 Split-root system experiments demonstrated root hair development of spinach in high P  
24 concentrations is not affected if the remainder of the root system is exposed to low P  
25 concentrations. In contrast, the magnitude of the positive effect on root hair development of  
26 limited  $\text{NO}_3^-$  varied between species. However, further research is needed into the effects of

1 differences in LR growth dynamics in response to localized fertilizer application on soil  
2 properties and subsequently erosion rates.

### 3 **6.Effects of LR proliferation on aerial growth**

4 Potential effects of LR proliferation on above ground biomass production are crucial to  
5 achieve high agricultural production, but may also be important in soil erosion control as  
6 mentioned before. Recent estimates suggest root proliferation is a relative low cost strategy  
7 adapted by plants to effectively absorb available ions and water in heterogeneous  
8 environments, requiring only an additional 0.2% of the plant's daily carbon gain (Hodge,  
9 2006). Only roots with small diameters proliferate (Drew, 1975; Granato and Raper, 1989;  
10 Smucker, 1993; McCully, 1999), as fine roots represent less resistance to the flow of ions and  
11 water during the uptake of these resources (Smucker, 1993). However, net C costs will be  
12 determined by factors such as rooting volume, photosynthetic supply and may be even zero if  
13 compensatory growth occurs (Robinson, 2001). This should buffer potential negative effects  
14 of limited nutrient availability within some soil areas on above ground biomass, although  
15 biomass partitioning ultimately depends on shoot nutrient status (Drew, 1975; Drew and  
16 Saker, 1975; Robinson, 1994). LR proliferation either increases or has no effect on root to  
17 shoot ratios (Robinson, 1994). Shoot development may be slightly retarded, which is reflected  
18 in lower shoot biomass of barley grown under heterogeneous nutrient availability compared to  
19 the controls (Drew and Saker, 1975). This shoot growth inhibition was attributed to initial  
20 nutrient deficiencies until the roots reached the nutrient-rich zone (Drew and Saker, 1975). In  
21 addition, placement of N fertilizer (calcium ammonium nitrate) at 10 cm depth compared to  
22 surface mixing significantly increased dry matter production and grain yield at maturity of  
23 wheat grown in a loamy sand soil (Sharma and Chaudhary,1983). However, there is a large  
24 variability between species (Robinson, 1994; Hodge, 2006) and genotypes (Sattelmacher *et*  
25 *al.*, 1993; Forde and Lorenzo, 2001) in their shoot responsiveness, which depends on

1 differences in nutrient uptake and utilization efficiency (Sattelmacher *et al.*, 1993).  
2 Nevertheless, LR proliferation may occur without limiting above ground growth (and yield).

### 3 **7.Conclusion**

4 In conclusion, plant roots are crucial in reducing soil erosion rates due to overland flow, as  
5 their presence affects soil properties such as aggregate stability, hydraulic function and shear  
6 strength. However, the effect of roots on soil erodibility is determined by RLD, and, thus, LR  
7 density and length, and the distribution of roots within the soil. It has been argued that a  
8 higher RLD would be particularly beneficial in reducing soil erosion rates and that fertilizer  
9 placement may be one way of achieving this In nutrient poor soils, the local availability of  
10 high N or P may result in LR proliferation, although the response will depend on plant  
11 species, and may include a general increase in rooting depth or compensatory growth.

12 However, research is needed to determine whether the localized application of N and P at  
13 specific soil depths may represent a potential management technique to control erosion of  
14 degraded agricultural soils with low nutrient levels. Investigations should therefore aim to  
15 explore the effects of LR distribution at varying depths on soil properties, and, hence, soil  
16 erodibility. Trade offs between reduced erodibility due to LR proliferation and potential  
17 reductions in soil hydraulic conductivity need to be explored. In addition, responsiveness of  
18 different crops, grasses and shrubs (and different genotypes within a species) to  
19 heterogeneous nutrient availability should be determined. Moreover, suitable depth(s) for  
20 deep fertilizer placement should be established (with reference to practical implementation)  
21 and the effects of varying environmental conditions, such as soil type, slope and flow  
22 characteristics, on the erosion reducing effect of this potential management technique needs to  
23 be assessed.

24



## 8. References

- 1
- 2 Abrahams, A.D, Parsons, A.J and Luk, S.H. (1988). Hydrologic and sediment responses to  
3 simulated rainfall on desert hillslopes in southern Arizona. *Catena*; **15**, 103–117.
- 4 Amezketa, E. (1999). Soil aggregate stability: a review. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture*,  
5 **14**, 83–151.
- 6 Archer, N.A.L., Quinton, J.N. and Hess, T.M. (2002). Below-ground relationships of soil  
7 texture, roots and hydraulic conductivity in two-phase mosaic vegetation in South-east Spain,  
8 *Journal of Arid Environments*, **52**, 535–553.
- 9 Basu, P., Brown, K.M. and Pal, A. (2011). Detailed Quantitative Analysis of Architectural  
10 Traits of Basal Roots of Young Seedlings of Bean in Response to Auxin and Ethylene. *Plant*  
11 *Physiology*, **155**, 2056–2065.
- 12 Bauhus, J. and Messier, C. (1999). Soil exploitation strategies of fine roots in different tree  
13 species of the southern boreal forest of eastern Canada. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*,  
14 **29**, 260–273.
- 15 Bertin, C., Yang, X. and Weston, L. (2003). The role of root exudates and allelochemicals in  
16 the rhizosphere. *Plant and Soil*, **256**, 67-83.
- 17 Boer, M. and Puidgefábregas, J. (2005). Effects of spatially structured vegetation patterns on  
18 hillslope erosion in a semiarid Mediterranean environment: a simulation study. *Earth Surface*  
19 *Processes and Landforms*, **30**, 149-167.
- 20 Bochet, E., Poesen, J. and Rubio, J.L. (2006). Runoff and soil loss under individual plants of a  
21 semi-arid Mediterranean shrubland: influence of plant morphology and rainfall intensity.  
22 *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, **31**, 536 -549.

- 1 Brevik, E. C., A. Cerdà, J. Mataix-Solera, L. Pereg, J. N. Quinton, J. Six and K. Van Oost  
2 (2015). The interdisciplinary nature of SOIL. *SOIL* 1(1): 117-129.
- 3 Bronick, C.J. and Lal, R. (2005). Soil structure and management: a review. *Geoderma*, **124**, 3  
4 –22.
- 5 Bryan, R.B. (2000). Soil erodibility and processes of water erosion on hillslope.  
6 *Geomorphology*, **32**, 385–415.
- 7 Burylo, M., Rey, F., Mathys, N. and Dutoit, T. (2012). Plant root traits affecting the resistance  
8 of soils to concentrated flow erosion. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, **37**, 1436-  
9 1470.
- 10 De Baets, S., Poesen, J., Gysels, G. and Knapen, A. (2006). Effects of grass roots on the  
11 erodibility of topsoil during concentrated flow. *Geomorphology*, **76**, 54-67.
- 12 De Baets, S., Poesen, J., Knapen, A. and Galindo, P. (2007). Impact of root architecture on  
13 the erosion-reducing potential of roots during concentrated flow. *Earth Surface Processes and*  
14 *Landforms*, **32**, 1323-1345.
- 15 De Baets, S.; Poesen, J.; Reubens, B.; Wemans, K.; De Baerdemaeker, J. and Muys, B.  
16 (2008). Tensile strength and root distribution of typical mediterranean plant species and their  
17 contribution to soil shear strength. *Plant and Soil*, **305**, 207-226.
- 18 Degens, B. P. (1997). Macro-aggregation of soils by biological bonding and binding  
19 mechanisms and the factors affecting these: A review. *Australian Journal of Soil Research*,  
20 **35**, 431-459.
- 21 Devitt, D.A. and Smith, S.D. (2002). Root channel macropores enhance downward movement  
22 of water in a Mojave Desert ecosystem. *Journal of Arid Environments*, **50**, 99-108.

- 1 Di Tomaso, J.M. (1995). Approaches for Improving Crop Competitiveness through the  
2 Manipulation of Fertilization Strategies. *Weed Science*, **43**, 491-497.
- 3 Drew, M.C. (1975). Comparison of the effects of a localized supply of phosphate, nitrate,  
4 ammonium and potassium on the growth of the seminal root system, and the shoot, in barley.  
5 *New Phytologist*, **75**, 479–490.
- 6 Drew, M.C. and Saker, L.R. (1975). Nutrient supply and the growth of the seminal root  
7 system of barley. II. Localized, compensatory increases in lateral root growth and rates of  
8 nitrate uptake when nitrate supply is restricted to only part of the root system. *Journal of*  
9 *Experimental Botany*, **26**, 79–90.
- 10 Drew, M.C., Saker, L.R. and Ashley, T.W. (1973). Nutrient supply and the growth of the  
11 seminal root system in barley. I. The effect of nitrate concentration on the growth of axes and  
12 laterals. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, **24**, 1189–1202.
- 13 Engineer, C.B. and Kranz, R.G. (2007). Reciprocal leaf and root expression of *AtAmt1.1* and  
14 root architectural changes in response to nitrogen starvation. *Plant Physiology*, **143**, 236–250.
- 15
- 16 Fitter, A.H. (1987). An architectural approach to the comparative ecology of plant root  
17 systems. *New Phytologist*, **106**, 61-77.
- 18 Foehse, D. and Jungk, A. (1983) Influence of phosphate and nitrate supply on root hair  
19 formation of rape, spinach and tomato plants. *Plant and Soil*, **74**, 359–368.
- 20 Forde, B.G. (2002). Local and long-range signaling pathways regulating plant responses to  
21 nitrate. *Annual Review of Plant Biology*, **53**, 203-224.

- 1 Forde, B.G. and Lorenzo, H. (2001). The nutritional control of root development. *Plant and*  
2 *Soil*, **232**, 51-68.
- 3 Foster, R.C. (1988). Microenvironments of soil microorganisms. *Biology and Fertility of*  
4 *Soils*, **6**, 189-203.
- 5 Genet, M., Stokes, A., Salin, F., Mickovski, S.B., Fourcaud, T., Dumail, J. and van Beek, R.  
6 (2005). The influence of cellulose content on tensile strength in tree roots. *Plant and Soil*,  
7 **278**,1-9.
- 8 Ghidry, F. and Alberts, E.E. (1997). Plant root effects on soil erodibility, splash detachment,  
9 soil strength, and aggregate stability. *Transactions of the American Society of Agricultural*  
10 *Engineers*, **40**, 129–35.
- 11 Gilroy, S. and Jones, D.L. (2000). Through form to function: root hair development and  
12 nutrient uptake. *Trends in Plant Science*, **2**, 56-60.
- 13 González-Pelayo, O., Andreu, V., Gimeno-García, E. and Rubio, J.L. (2010). Rainfall  
14 influence on plot-scale runoff and soil loss from repeated burning in a Mediterranean-shrub  
15 ecosystem, Valencia, Spain. *Geomorphology*, **118**, 444-452.
- 16 Granato, T.C. and Raper JR, D. (1989). Proliferation of maize (*Zea mays* L.) roots in response  
17 to localized supply of nitrate. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, **40**, 263-275.
- 18 Guerrero-Campo, J., Palacio, S., Pérez-Rontomé, C. and Montserrat-Martí, G. (2006). Effect  
19 of root system morphology on root-sprouting and shoot-rooting abilities in 123 plant species  
20 from eroded lands in North-east Spain. *Annals of Botany*, **98**, 439-447.
- 21 Gyssels, G. and Poesen, J. (2003). The importance of plant root characteristics in controlling  
22 concentrated flow erosion rates. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, **28**, 371–384.

- 1 Gyssels, G., Poesen, J., Bochet, E. and Li, Y. (2005). Impact of plant roots on the resistance  
2 of soils to erosion by water: a review. *Progress in Physical Geography*, **29**, 189-217.
- 3 Hales, T.C., Ford, C.R., Hwang, T., Vose, J.M. and Band, L.E. (2009). Topographic and  
4 ecological controls on root reinforcement. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, **114**, 1-17.
- 5 Hallett, P.D., Gordon, D.C. and Bengough, A.G. (2003). Plant influence on rhizosphere  
6 hydraulic properties: direct measurements using a miniaturized infiltrometer. *New*  
7 *Phytologist*, **157**, 597–603
- 8 Hathaway, R.L. and Penny, D. (1975). Root strength in some populus and salix clones. *New*  
9 *Zealand Journal of Botany*, **13**, 333–344.
- 10 Haynes, R.J. and Beare, M.H. (1997). Influence of six crop species on aggregate stability and  
11 some labile organic matter fractions. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, **29**, 1647-1653.
- 12 Hochholdinger, F., Woll, K., Sauer, M. and Dembinsky, D. (2004). Genetic dissection of root  
13 formation in Maize (*Z. mays*) reveals root-type specific developmental programmes. *Annals*  
14 *of Botany*, **93**, 359-368.
- 15 Hodge, A. (2006). Plastic plants and patchy soils. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, **57**, 401-  
16 411.
- 17 Jankauskas, B., Jankauskiene, G. and Fullen, M.A. (2008). Soil erosion changes in the  
18 physical properties of Lithuanian Eutric Albeluvisols under different land use systems. *Acta*  
19 *Agriculturae Scandinavica Section B – Soil and Plant Science*, **58**, 66-76.
- 20 Jin, K., Shen, J., Ashton, R.W., White, R.P., Dodd, I.C., Parry, M.A.J. and Whalley, W.R.  
21 (2015). Wheat root growth responses to horizontal stratification of fertiliser in a water-limited  
22 environment. *Plant and Soil*, **386**, 77-88.

- 1 Jing, J., Rui, Y., Zhang, F., Rengel, Z. and Shen, J. (2010). Localized application of  
2 phosphorus and ammonium improves growth of maize seedlings by stimulating root  
3 proliferation and rhizosphere acidification. *Field Crops Research*, **119**, 355-364.
- 4 Jones, B. and Ljung, K. (2012). Subterranean space exploration: the development of root  
5 system architecture. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*, **15**, 97–102.
- 6 Knapen, A., Poesen, J., Govers, G., Gyssels, G. and Nachtergaele, J. (2007). Resistance of  
7 soils to concentrated flow erosion: A review, *Earth-Science Reviews*, **80**, 75–109.
- 8 Lal, R. (2001). Soil degradation by erosion, *Land Degradation and Development*, **12**, 519-  
9 539.
- 10 Lal, R. (2010). Managing soils for a warming earth in a food-insecure and energy-starved  
11 world, *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science*, **173**, 4-15.
- 12 Li, Y., Zhu, X.-M. and Tian, J.-Y. (1991). Effectiveness of plant roots to increase the anti-  
13 scourability of soil on the Loess Plateau. *Chinese Science Bulletin*, **36**, 2077–2082.
- 14 Li, P. and Li, Z. (2011). Soil reinforcement by a root system and its effects on sediment yield  
15 in response to concentrated flow in the loess plateau. *Agricultural Sciences*, **2**, 86-93.
- 16 Linkohr, B.I., Williamson, L.C., Fitter, A.H. and Leyser, O. (2002). Nitrate and phosphate  
17 availability and distribution have different effects on root system architecture of *Arabidopsis*.  
18 *The Plant Journal*, **29**, 751-760.
- 19 Loades, K.W., Bengough, A.G., Bransby, M.F. and Hallet, P.D. (2010). Plant density  
20 influence on fibrous root reinforcement of soils. *Ecological Engineering*, **36**, 276-284.
- 21 Lynch, J.P. and Brown, K.M. (2012). New roots for agriculture: exploiting the root phenome.  
22 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, **367**, 1598–1604.

1 López-Bucio, J., Cruz-Ramírez, A. and Estrella-Herrera, L. (2003). The role of nutrient  
2 availability in regulating root architecture. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*, **6**, 280-287.

3 Macleod, C.J.A., Binley, A., Hawkins, S.L., Humphreys, M.W., Turner, L.B., Whalley, W.R.  
4 and Haygarth, P.M. (2007). Genetically modified hydrographs: what can grass genetics do for  
5 temperate catchment hydrology? *Hydrological Processes*, **21**, 2217-2221.

6 Malamy, J.E. (2005). Intrinsic and environmental response pathways that regulate root system  
7 architecture. *Plant, Cell and Environment*, **28**, 67-77.

8 Mamo, M. and Bubenzer, G.D. (2001a). Detachment rate, soil erodibility and soil strength as  
9 influenced by living plant roots: Part II. Field study. *American Society of Agricultural*  
10 *Engineers*, **44**, 1175– 1181.

11 Mamo, M. and Bubenzer, G.D. (2001b). Detachment rate, soil erodibility and soil strength as  
12 influenced by living plant roots: Part I. Laboratory study. *American Society of Agricultural*  
13 *Engineers*, **44**, 1167–1174.

14 McCully, M.E. (1999). Roots in soil: unearthing the complexities of roots and their  
15 rhizospheres. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular Biology*, **50**, 695-718.

16 Meek, B.D., Rechel, E.A., Carter, L.M. and De Tar, W.R. (1989). Changes in infiltration  
17 under alfalfa as influenced by time and wheel traffic. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*,  
18 **53**, 238–241.

19 Mitchell, A.R., Ellsworth, T.R. and Meek, B.D. (1995). Effects of root systems on preferential  
20 flow in swelling soils. *Communication in Soil Science and Plant Analysis*, **26**, 2655-2666.

21 Morel, J.L., Habib, L., Plantureux, S. and Guckert, A. (1991). Influence of maize root  
22 mucilage on soil aggregate stability. *Plant and Soil*, **136**, 111-119.

- 1 Moreno-Espíndola, I.P., Rivera-Becerril, F., De Jesús Ferrera-Guerrero, M. and De León-  
2 González, F. (2007). Role of root-hairs and hyphae in adhesion of sand particles. *Soil Biology*  
3 *and Biochemistry*, **39**, 2520-2526.
- 4 Morgan, R.P.C. (1986). *Soil Erosion & Conservation* (2nd ed.). Longman, Harlow, UK.
- 5 Morgan, R.P.C., Quinton, J.N. & Edwards, J. (1995). 3.05 Vegetation strategies for  
6 combating desertification. MEDALUS II Project 3 Managing Desertification. Contract  
7 EV5V-CT92-0165. Final Report covering the period 1 January 1991 to 30 September 1995.
- 8 Müller, M. and Schmidt, W. (2004). Environmentally induced plasticity of root hair  
9 development in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Physiology*, **134**, 409–419.
- 10 Oades, J.M. (1984). Soil organic matter and structural stability: mechanisms and implications  
11 for management. *Plant and Soil*, **76**, 319-337.
- 12 Paterson, E., Sim, A., Standing, D., Dorward, M. and McDonald, A.J.S. (2006). Root  
13 exudation from *Hordeum vulgare* in response to localized nitrate supply. *Journal of*  
14 *Experimental Botany*, **57**, 2413-2420.
- 15 Pierret, A.; Latchackak, K.; Chathanvongsa, P.; Sengtaheuanghoung, O. and Valentin, C.  
16 (2007). Interactions between root growth, slopes and soil detachment depending on land use:  
17 a case study of a small mountain catchment in Northern Laos. *Plant and Soil*, **301**, 51-64.
- 18 Pimentel, D. (2006). Soil erosion: a food and environmental threat. *Environment,*  
19 *Development and Sustainability*, **8**, 119-137.
- 20 Pimentel, D. and Kounang, N. (1998). Ecology of soil erosion in ecosystems. *Ecosystems*, **1**,  
21 416-426.



- 1 Pohl, M., Alig, D., Körner, C. and Rixen, C. (2009). Higher plant diversity enhances soil  
2 stability in disturbed alpine ecosystems. *Plant and Soil*, **324**, 91-102.
- 3 Pojasok, T. and Kay, B.D. (1990). Effect of root exudates from corn and bromegrass on soil  
4 structural stability. *Canadian Journal of Soil Science*, **70**, 351 – 362.
- 5 Posthumus, H., Deeks, L.K., Rickson, R.J. and Quinton, J.N. (2013). Costs and benefits of  
6 erosion control measures in the UK. *Soil Use and Management*, DOI: 10.1111/sum.12057
- 7 Prosser, I.P., Dietrich, W.E. and Stevenson, J. (1995). Flow resistance and sediment transport  
8 by concentrated overland flow in a grassland valley. *Geomorphology*, **13**, 71–86.
- 9 Puigdefábregas, J. (2005). The role of vegetation patterns in structuring runoff and sediment  
10 fluxes in drylands. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, **30**, 133-147.
- 11 Quinton, J.N., Morgan, R.P.C., Archer, N.A., Hall, G.M., Green, A. (2002). Bioengineering  
12 principles and desertification mitigation. In: Brandt, C.J., Geeson, N.A., Thornes, J.B. (Eds.)  
13 Mediterranean desertification, A mosaic of processes and responses. John Wiley and Sons,  
14 Chichester, p.93-105.
- 15 Reubens, B., Poesen, J., Danjon, F., Geudens, G. and Muys, B. (2007). The role of fine and  
16 coarse roots in shallow slope stability and soil erosion control with a focus on root system  
17 architecture: a review. *Trees*, **21**, 385-402.
- 18 Rilling, M.C., Wright, S.F. and Eviner, V.T. (2002). The role of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi  
19 and glomalin in soil aggregation: comparing effects of five plant species. *Plant and Soil*, **238**,  
20 325-333.
- 21 Robinson, D. (1994). The response of plants to non-uniform supplies of nutrients. *New*  
22 *Phytologist*, **127**, 635-674.

- 1 Robinson, D. (2001). Root proliferation, nitrate inflow and their carbon costs during nitrogen  
2 capture by competing plants in patchy soil. *Plant and Soil*, **232**, 41-50.
- 3 Roycewicz, P.S. and Malamy, J.E. (2014). Cell wall properties play an important role in the  
4 emergence of lateral root primordia from the parent root. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, **65**,  
5 2057–2069.
- 6 Sattelmacher, B., Gerendas, J., Thoms, K., Brück, H. and Bagdady, N.H. (1993). Interaction  
7 between root growth and mineral nutrition. *Environmental and Experimental Botany*, **33**, 63-  
8 73.
- 9 Sharma, B.R. and Chaudhary, T.N. (1983). Wheat root growth, grain yield and water uptake  
10 as influenced by soil water regime and depth of nitrogen placement in a loamy sand soil.  
11 *Agricultural Water Management*, **6**, 365-373.
- 12 Smucker, A.J.M. (1993). Soil environmental modifications of root dynamics and  
13 measurement. *Annual Review of Phytopathology*, **31**, 191-216.
- 14 Stocking, M. and Elwell, H. (1976). Vegetation and erosion: A review. *Scottish Geographical*  
15 *Magazine*, **92**, 4-16.
- 16 Stokes, A., Atger, C., Bengough, A.G., Fourcaud, T. and Sidle, R.C. (2009). Desirable plant  
17 root traits for protecting natural and engineered slopes against landslides. *Plant and Soil*, **324**,  
18 1–30.
- 19 Tengbeh, G. T. (1993). The effect of grass roots on shear strength variations with moisture  
20 content. *Soil Technology*, **6**, 287-295.
- 21 Trimble, S.W. and Mendel, A.C. (1995). The cow as a geomorphic agent – a critical review.  
22 *Geomorphology*, **13**, 233-253.

1 Vázquez-Méndez, R., Ventura-Ramos, E., Oleschko, K., Hernández-Sandoval, L., Parrot, J.-  
2 F. and Nearing, M.A. (2010). Soil erosion and runoff in different vegetation patches from  
3 semiarid Central Mexico. *Catena*, **80**, 162-169.

4 Waldron, L. J. (1977). Shear resistance of root-permeated homogenous and stratified soil. *Soil*  
5 *Science Society of America Journal*, **41**, 843-849

6 Walker, T.S., Harsh, P.B., Grotewold, E. and Vivanco, J.M. (2003). Root exudates and  
7 rhizosphere biology. *Plant Physiology*, **132**, 44-51.

8 Watt, M., McCully, M.E. and Canny, M.J. (1994). Formation and stabilization of rhizosheats  
9 of *Z. mays* L. *Plant Physiology*, **106**, 179-186.

10 Wenzel, W.W. (2009). Rhizosphere processes and management in plant-assisted  
11 bioremediation (phytoremediation) of soils. *Plant and Soil*, **321**, 385–408.

12 Zhang, H. and Forde, B.G. (1998) An Arabidopsis MADS box gene that controls nutrient-  
13 induced changes in root architecture. *Science*, **279**, 407-409.

14 Zhou, Z.C. and Shangguan, Z.P. (2007). The effects of ryegrass roots and shoots on loess  
15 erosion under simulated rainfall. *Catena*, **70**, 350-355.

16 Zhu, J., Kaeppler, S. and Lynch, J.P. (2005). Mapping of QTLs for lateral root branching and  
17 length in maize (*Zea mays* L.) under differential phosphorus supply. *Theoretical and Applied*  
18 *Genetics*, **111**, 688–695.

19

20




Figure 1. Key mechanisms by which plant roots influence soil physical properties

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

1  
2  
3  
4




Figure 2. Effect of a localised supply of phosphate, nitrate, ammonium, and potassium on root form. Control plants received the complete nutrient solution to all parts of the root system. The other roots received the complete nutrient solution only in the middle zone (shaded), the top and bottom being supplied with a solution deficient in the specified nutrient. Adapted and reproduced with permission from Drew (1975) © John Wiley and Sons

5