Diverging consequences of past forest management on plant and soil attributes in ancient oak forests of southwestern Iran

Mehdi Heydari, Sina Attar Roshan, Manuel Esteban Lucas-Borja, Reza Omidipour, Bernard Prevosto

▶ To cite this version:

1

Diverging consequences of past forest management on plant and soil attributes in ancient oak forests of southwestern Iran

Mehdi Heydari[1*], Sina Attar Roshan[2], Manuel Esteban Lucas-Borja[3], Reza Omidipour[4], Bernard Prévosto[5]

*1 Department of Forest Science, Faculty of Agriculture, Ilam University, Ilam, Iran; m_heydari23@yahoo.com

2 Department of Environment, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Ahvaz University, Ahvaz, Iran; sina_2934@yahoo.com

3 Escuela Técnica Superior Ingenieros Agrónomos y Montes, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Campus Universitario, E-02071 Albacete, Spain; manuelesteban.lucas@uclm.es

4 Department of Rangeland and Watershed Management, Faculty of Agriculture, Ilam University, Ilam, Iran; r.omidipour@yahoo.com

5 INRAE, Aix Marseille Univ., UMR RECOVER, Mediterranean Ecosystems and Risks, Aix-en-Provence, France; bernard.prevosto@inrae.fr

Corresponding author: Dr. Mehdi Heydari; Email: m_heydari23@yahoo.com; m.heidari@ilam.ac.ir

32

33

Diverging consequences of past forest management on plant and soil attributes in ancient oak forests of southwestern Iran

Abstract

The oak (*Quercus brantii* Lindl.) semiarid forests of western Iran are among the oldest and host a remarkable diversity. However, the originally high forests were largely converted to coppices and submitted to a long history of traditional management and human disturbances. We investigated the effect of past management and forest structure on soil properties and vegetation diversity on two forest systems: coppice-with-standards stands abandoned after an intense period of exploitation (CWS) and high forest stands (HF) submitted to a low intensity of management. We selected in each system three 1-2 ha stands and sampled 30 plots to measure vegetation diversity, forest structure using structural indices and, main soil factors including bulk density, nutrients, organic carbon and porosity. We found a higher species diversity in HF than in CWS with respectively 7 woody species in the former and only 4 in the latter as well as a higher structural complexity. Plant composition differed also between the two systems and multivariate analyses revealed clear associations between vegetation composition and soil factors in particular soil nutrients, soil porosity for HF and bulk density and texture for CWS. In fact, contents in soil nutrients were higher in HF than in CWS for total nitrogen (0.28 vs 0.15 %), available phosphorus (22.82 vs 15.47 ppm), available nitrogen (0.28 vs 0.15 ppm), and organic matter (2.58 vs 1.61 %) whereas soils of CWS showed a higher bulk density (1.39 vs 1.29) and a lower porosity (47.66 vs 51.50 %). This study thus revealed the legacy of the past forest management actions on the different components of the forest ecosystem. We concluded that the conservative management in high forests was more favourable for the protection of soil and vegetation diversity than in the traditional coppicing system.

Keywords: Natural regeneration, plant diversity, semiarid forest ecosystems, soil properties, Coppice

INTRODUCTION

Forest ecosystems sustain different services and functions, such as carbon and nutrient cycling or water cycle regulation, critical for human populations. But at the same time, forests are highly vulnerable to unsustainable forest management and climate change-related disturbances such as wildfires or droughts (Byrnes et al., 2014). Forest management plays an important role in shaping the vegetation composition, plant diversity and forest structure. This influence depends on the intensity, nature, extension in space and time of the management actions as well as the type of the dominant species in the forest ecosystem (Mei et al., 2020; Strubelt et al., 2019; Scolastri et al., 2017; Govaert et al., 2020). It is widely recognized that most forests have been influenced for centuries by traditional activities and transformed to meet the human needs such as the coppice and coppice with standards systems to produce wood and other products (e.g. fodder, fruits, bark) (Dlamini, 2013; Magagnotti et al., 2018).

The coppice stands grow mainly from shoots that emerge from dormant buds on the stumps after the end of the cutting cycle. In each cycle, which lasts approximately between 10 and 30 years, single-stemmed trees scattered among coppice stools are retained (standards). These standard trees are allowed to grow for several coppice cycles, and one-third to one-quarter of them are cut in each cycle. This specific structure is defined as a coppice-with-standards (CWS) and represents a traditional forest system, which allows the production of more diverse wood products than the single coppice systems (CS) as it includes not only wood for fuel (coppice) but also timber for industry (standards). Over time, for various reasons, such as changing market demand or the replacement of wood with fossil fuels, these traditional systems have been willingly or unwillingly abandoned to the benefit of the high forest system (Lo Monaco et al., 2011; Biˇcík et al., 2001; Marchi et al., 2016).

High forests are composed of planted or seed-origin individuals and their cycles last between 50 and 200 years (Van Calster et al. 2008; Venanzi et al., 2019; Becker et al., 2017). Following tree harvesting, forest stands regenerate through interactions among propagules, including seeds in seed banks and those dispersed into a site (Lucas-Borja et al 2017). After this disturbance (tree harvesting), the floor and soil conditions change radically (Lucas-Borja et al., 2020) and are usually more favorable to the development of

98   new seedlings in comparison with preexisting conditions. Canopy characteristics,
99   understory vegetation diversity, site factors and individual species performance were
100 recognized to play crucial roles in natural regeneration forest (Modrý, 2004; Heydari et
101 al., 2017 b). However, natural regeneration is an unpredictable process because of the
102 complex interactions between biotic and abiotic factors determining the success of
103 seedling establishment (Tardos et al., 2018).

104 The effects of these past management systems and their changes on various aspects of
105 forest diversity and forest structure have not yet been fully investigated. Historical reports
106 indicate that irregular and intense use of coppice and coppice-with-standards has led to
107 degradation in forest stands (Hasel and Schwarz, 2006; Venanzi et al., 2020). It was also
108 shown that forest stands that experienced heavy wood extraction 100 to 200 years ago
109 have undergone major changes in terms of various structural features (Van Calster et al.,
110 2008; Wäldchen et al., 2013). Besides, changes in management regimes such as
111 conversion of coppices to high forests (or the reverse) can have significant effects on plant
112 composition, plant diversity, seedling recruitment as well as on the relationships among
113 these components and with various abiotic factors such as soil factors (e.g. Scolastri et
114 al., 2017). These different changes are closely linked to the modification of the overstorey
115 structure creating various and contrasted environmental conditions or microclimates in
116 the forest floor (Van Calster et al., 2007; Van Calster et al., 2008; Baeten et al., 2009;
117 Heydari et al., 2017; Venanzi et al., 2019). In fact, the management regime deeply
118 influences the dominant canopy cover (e.g. composition, openness, tree dimensions)
119 which in turn modifies the development and composition of the understory (Van Calster
120 et al., 2008). All these changes affect litter inputs in terms of quantity and quality and
121 conditions of litter decomposition due to modifications of light and soil moisture
122 availability. In turn, these processes influence soil nutrients which play a major role in
123 the establishment of the tree regeneration (Heydari et al., 2017). When forest management
124 is intense, physical and chemical soil properties can be negatively affected (e.g. soil
125 compaction after harvesting operations) leading to restrictions on tree growth and natural
126 regeneration (e.g. Marchi et al., 2016) although such negative impacts are not the rule
127 (e.g. Venanzi et al., 2019). In this regard, some researchers have stated that traditional
128 coppicing management is part of the long history of ecosystems, and cannot been seen as
129 a disruption factor as it can support a high level of diversity (Gondard et al. 2006; Bartha
130 et al., 2008; Mattioli et al. 2016; Müllerová et al., 2015; Della Longa et al., 2020).
131 However, some other studies have emphasized the negative effects of repeated cuts on

132 soil properties, plant composition and regeneration (Nave et al., 2010; Marchi et al.,
133 2016).

134 The oak (*Quercus brantii* Lindl.) forests of western Iran are considered to be among the
135 oldest oak forests in the world. These originally high forests (i.e. regenerated by seeds)
136 were converted to coppices or coppices with standards and were submitted to a long
137 history of traditional management including frequent and traditional cutting, especially
138 for firewood. An abrupt change occurred in the management of these forests with the
139 nationalization policy of forests about 50 years ago (Valipour et al., 2014). Many forest
140 stands came under government protection and the traditional system was abandoned to
141 the benefit of a less intense management. As a consequence, old coppice-with-standards
142 abandoned stands were largely dominant among the different forest types. Such fast
143 changes in the management regime were also documented in European forests during the
144 second half of the 19th century (e.g. Martin et al., 2015).

145 The effect of species composition on soil properties has been largely studied (Laganière
146 et al., 2012; Waring et al., 2016; Heydari et al., 2020). However, the effects of different
147 management measures, including long-term abandonment of coppice-with-standards, on
148 the plant diversity of the forest floor and on the regeneration of woody species have not
149 received such a large attention. Some studies have shown that active coppices compared
150 to coppices abandoned for more than fifty years exhibit a reduced soil fertility (Martin et
151 al., 2015). However, other studies have shown that 15 years is a sufficient time to recover
152 soil conditions in deciduous forests (Marchi et al., 2016) or that no effect has been noticed
153 on soil properties (Van Calster et al., 2007). Nevertheless, there is still an active debate
154 about the economic and ecological advantages and disadvantages of the different
155 management systems and the impact of the transition of one system to another (e.g.
156 coppices vs high forests). In particular, there is a growing interest in redeveloping coppice
157 systems in some communities mainly for economic reasons, in particular a fast production
158 of biomass or firewood products and an easier regeneration, but also sometimes for
159 ecological purposes such as to favor biodiversity linked to a variety of microhabitats due
160 to the multi-stemmed growth form of the trees (Kirby et al. 2017; Yücesan et al., 2019;
161 Riccioli et al., 2020; Mattioli et al. 2016). In this study, we evaluated various aspects such
162 as forest structure, plant species diversity, regeneration and soil attributes in two forest
163 systems: coppice-with-standards stands abandoned after an intense period of exploitation
164 and high forest stands submitted to a low intensity of management. More specifically, we
165 seek to answer the following two questions: 1) What is the influence of past forest

166 management on understorey plant diversity and shrubs/trees natural regeneration? 2) To

167 what extent soil properties differ between the two management systems?

168 We expect that the answers to these questions will help to better manage semi-arid oak

169 forests and restore their remarkable diversity.

170

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study area

173 The forest stands under study were located within the same area (approximately 240 ha)

174 in Zagros deciduous forests of south-western Iran (Fig. 1) and in very similar climatic and

175 physiographic conditions. In this area, mean annual rainfall is 576.4 mm (Izeh

176 meteorological station) with strong seasonal variations (from 0 mm in summer to a

177 maximum of 294 mm in winter) and mean annual temperature is 19.1 °C. This climate

178 can be classified as a semi-arid climate according to the De Martonne's climatic

179 classification. The dominant soil in the study area is Inceptisol (Soil Survey Staff 2014)

180 i.e. shallow calcareous soils with a clay-loam texture. Mean elevation ranges from 1400

181 to 1650 m a.s.l. and the general topography is flat or moderate slopes (<25%). The area

182 is covered by oak forests with an overstory dominated by the Brant's oak (*Quercus brantii*

183 Lindl.) and an understory with different woody species in particular *Crataegus azarolus*,

184 *Pistacia atlantica*, *Amygdalus orientalis*, *Acer monspessulanum*, A*mygdalus scoparia,*

185 *Amygdalus lycioides* (Heydari et al., 2017 a). Cover of both strata is less than 25%.

186

Forest management and sampling

188 Forests of the study area were submitted to a traditional management which was intense

189 to respond to the strong demand of the population in wood products particularly firewood

190 and charcoal production. At present two main oak forest systems are found: i) old

191 coppices with standards (CWS) and ii) old high forests (HF). The preexisting high forest

192 was converted into a coppice with standards system and submitted to coppicing for

193 centuries. However, in the middle of the 20th century, forests were nationalized and the

194 traditional management was abandoned (Valipour et al., 2014). Instead, forests were

195 protected against intense and frequent cuttings, firewood exploitation and grazing by

196 fencing and a reinforced surveillance by the guards of the Natural Resources Office.

197 Consequently, a shift in the forest structure occurred from young overexploited coppices

198 with a low canopy cover to mature coppices with standards i.e. with trees of greater

199 dimensions and a higher forest cover. The second type of forest structure (High Forests,

HF) are derived from some preexisting oak forests which were preserved from the intense traditional management for various reasons. In most cases, these forests were remote from villages or were willingly protected by their private owners. These forests are now composed of old trees and are not intensively exploited.

In this study, our is aim to evaluate the influence of two contrasted past management systems on soil properties, forest structure, plant composition and regeneration. To achieve this objective we have selected a total of six stands (three stands of 1 to 2 ha in each type: CWS and HF) spaced out 250 to 500 m in similar site conditions (in particular a flat topography and comparable soils). With this approach, we have tried to minimize possible confounding factors although we cannot formally exclude pre-existing site differences. Then, two transects of 200 m length and 250 m apart were set up in each stand with a random starting point. Five 20 m×20 m plots, spaced 50 m apart from each other, were placed along each transect i.e. a total of 30 plots in each system (CWS and HF).

Soil properties

In each plot, three soil samples were collected up to 25 cm depth and then mixed in a composite sample. These samples were then sieved (2-mm diameter) and air-dried prior to physical and chemical analyses based on standard methods (see Heydari et al., 2017 a). Soil analyses were carried out 15 days after sampling. Soil parameters included soil texture (contents in sand, silt and clay), soil porosity, soil organic carbon (OC), total nitrogen (Ntot), available phosphorus (Pava), available potassium (Kava), electrical conductivity (EC). Additional undisturbed soil cores were collected for the determination of bulk density (BD) in the 0–15 cm mineral layer (Blake and Hartge 1986).

Vegetation and regeneration measurements

In each plot, the large and small diameter of each tree's crown with a DBH > 7.5 cm were measured to compute the percentage of canopy cover of all woody species. The seedlings (height <1.30 m) were counted for each woody species on a 10m×10m subplot located in the center of the main plot and the cover of herbaceous species was visually estimated using four 1-m^2 subplots located in the four corners of the main plot (i.e. 30×4×2= 240 subplots in each system).

Stand structural indices

In each plot, all trees and shrubs taller than 1.30 m were counted and diameter at breast height (with a tree caliper) and total height (with a Haga altimeter) of all tree species were measured. Then the following structural indices were computed at plot level:

.

The species mingling index (MI) was calculated using Eq. 1 (Pommerening, 2002):

$$M_j = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} V_{ij} \quad M_j \epsilon\, [0, 1] \qquad \textbf{Equation 1}$$

where M_j is species mingling, n is the number of the nearest neighbors (n=3); $V_{ij} = 1$, if the reference tree i and neighbour tree j are different tree species and 0 otherwise. Lower values of MI reflected purity or very low presence of other woody species. In each plot, we selected the reference tree as the tree the closest to the plot centre and then we computed the MI value according to Eq. 1. This approach was used because of the low number of trees in the plot (4-5 trees) and to avoid border effects (i.e. selecting a reference tree which neighbours are located outside the plot). Height and diameter differentiation (HD and DD respectively) indices (T_{ij}) were computed using Eq. 2. In each plot, a reference tree (i) was randomly selected as well as its three nearest woody neighbours (j).

$$T_i = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} T_{ij}$$

$$T_{ij} = 1 - \frac{\min(DBHi\,.\,DBHj)}{\max(DBHi\,.\,DBHj)} \quad \text{or}\ T_{ij} = 1 - \frac{\min(Heigh\ .\ Heightj)}{\max(Heighti\,.\,Heigh\ )} \quad T_i\, \epsilon\, [0, 1] \qquad \textbf{Equation 2}$$

These equations were used for the three pairs of reference woody-neighbour species and the Tij indices were calculated as the mean of the three individual calculations. The higher value of the index (close to 1) show the higher diversity in terms of tree size. In addition, total canopy cover (TCC), basal area (BA), tree density and mean height of woody species were also recorded in each plot.

Statistical analyses

The plot was considered as the study unit. Different environmental and stand structural variables such as MI, HD, DD, TCC, BA, density of woody species, mean height of woody species (mean H), sand, silt, clay, bulk density, porosity, OC, Ntot, Pava, K, pH, EC, C/N were surveyed at plot level. Moreover, understory plant composition and shrubs and tree regeneration species were surveyed at plot scale. Differences between CWS and

265   HF were studied using a resemblance matrix (i.e. a symmetrical 60×60 matrix containing

266   the similarities between all pairs of samples) for environmental and stand structural

267   variables (and two biological matrices: understory plant composition and shrubs and tree

268   regeneration species). The resemblance is the general term in PRIMER software used to

269   cover (dis)similarity or distance coefficients between all pairs of samples. All the

270   variables of the environmental matrix were log x+1 transformed and the resemblance

271   matrix was built using the Euclidean distance. The variables included in the biological

272   matrixes were square root transformed and the resemblance matrix was built using the

273   Bray Curtis distance. Then, an analysis of similarities (ANOSIM), described by Clarke

274   (1993), was developed for the environmental and stand structural matrix in order to check

275   differences among environmental variables for each type of forest management.

276   ANOSIM routine was also used for checking differences among understory plant

277   composition or shrub and tree regeneration species between each type (CWS *vs* HF).

278   Secondly, environmental and stand structural variables were analyzed using non-metric

279   Multi-Dimensional Scaling (MDS) and the Kruskal stress formula (minimum stress: 0.01)

280   for visualizing the level of similarity of individual cases of each biological matrix

281   (understory plant composition, shrubs and tree regeneration species). Thirdly, we applied

282   the RELATE routine to check statistical significance of the relation between the

283   environmental and stand structural and the two biological matrixes. Fourthly, the

284   DIVERSE routine was used for calculating richness and different plant diversity indices

285   (Margalef's richness, Pielou's evenness, Shannon and Simpson's diversity). A Spearman

286   correlation analysis was finally made using environmental and stand structural variables,

287   MDS1 and MDS2 of understory vegetation matrix and natural regeneration matrix and

288   biodiversity indices. Statistical analyses were made using PRIMER V6 software (Clarke

289   and Gorley, 2006; Anderson et al., 2008).

290

291   **RESULTS**

292   **Comparison of soil properties and stand structural features**

293   Analysis of similarity (ANOSIM) of the matrices of the physical and chemical soil and

294   stand structural features showed statistically significant differences between CWS and

295   HF (Sample statistic (Global R): 0.98, Significance level of sample statistic: 0.1%). For

296   soil properties, mean values of OC, Ntot, Pava, Kava, sand and porosity were significantly

297   higher in HF than in CWS. In contrast, pH, EC, C/N, silt, clay and BD mean values were

298   significantly higher in CWS than HF. For stand structural features, mean values of all

299 measured variables (except woody species density), i.e. MI, HD, DD, TCC, BA and

300 height of woody species, were significantly higher in HF than in CWS (Table 1).

301

302 **Understory vegetation and regeneration composition**

303 Analysis of similarity of the understory plant composition matrix and of the tree

304 regeneration species matrix showed statistically significant differences between CWS and

305 HF (Sample statistics (Global R): 0.95 and 0.69 respectively, significance level of sample

306 statistic: 0.1%). In accordance with the pairwise comparison among factors (Fig. 2 and

307 3), the MDS analyses clearly separated the two forest systems when analyzing each

308 biological matrix indicating that both CWS and HF significantly differed in terms of

309 composition of the understory vegetation and composition of the regeneration in shrubs

310 and trees.

311

312 After applying the RELATE routine, we found a statistical significant relationship

313 between the measured variable matrix and both the understory plant composition and

314 woody regeneration species matrixes. More precisely, the environmental and stand

315 structural variables have a significant influence on understory plant diversity

316 (significance level of sample statistic: 0.1 %, (Rho): 0.738) and on the composition of

317 regeneration in woody species (Significance level of sample statistic: 0.1 %, (Rho):

318 0.477). We found that the composition vegetation of HF and CWS plots were clearly

319 distinct. The HF vegetation composition was associated with higher soil nutrients (Ntot,

320 Pava and Kava), higher soil porosity, as well as higher values of the structural indices

321 (MI, BA, DD and HD). In contrast, the vegetation composition of CWS reflected different

322 soil parameters such as such as higher BD, EC, clay and silt values as well as a higher

323 density of woody species (Fig 2).

324 Composition of the regeneration in woody species clearly separated along the first axis

325 of the MDS axis1. More precisely, the vegetation composition in HF included *Quercus*

326 *brantii*, *Acer monspessulanum*, *Crataegus azarolus*, *Pistacia atlantica*, *Amygdalus*

327 *orientalis*, *Amygdalus scoparia* and *Amygdalus lycioides* and was found on more fertile

328 soils. In contrast, vegetation composition of CWS was less diverse (only *Quercus brantii*,

329 *Crataegus azarolus*, *Amygdalus scoparia* and *Amygdalus lycioides*) and was associated

330 with less fertile soils showing higher BD, EC, pH , clay, silt values and with stands with

331 different structural indices (Fig 3).

332

Regeneration density and diversity indices

Results of the DIVERSE routine showed statistical differences of the understory vegetation and regeneration diversity indices between the two forest types: all values were higher in HF than in CWS (Table 2). Density of the woody regeneration was significantly higher in HF than in CWS whatever the species (Table 3). Total density was $1.19/m^2$ in HF and only $0.43/m^2$ all species together. This low density in CWS was explained by the absence of some woody species and a reduced density of the dominant oak species.

Relationships between vegetation composition and environmental and stand structural variables

According to the DISTLIM procedure, the best model for predicting understory plant composition using the environmental and stand structural variables is the model using solely the soil organic matter content (R^2=0.39; AICc=431.49, Table 4). Similarly, the best model (R^2=0.44; AICc=395.51) for predicting the composition of the woody regeneration using the environmental and stand structural variables was a model including soil organic matter (OC), mean height (H) and the mean height differentiation index (HD)(Table 5). According to the Distance-based redundancy analysis (dbRDA) plots generated by the DISTLM procedure, the percentage of variation explained by axis 1 was 99.5% out of the fitted model and 36.5% out of total variation in the case of the understory plant composition (Fig. 4). The model, clearly separated HF and CWS plots according to the OC parameter (Fig. 4). The dbRDA plot (Fig. 5) shows the distribution of the sampled plots of the two forest types (HF, CWS) according to the similarity of the composition of the woody regeneration in the factorial map defined by the two axes. The first axis explains 83.7% of the fitted model and 37.4% of the total variation whereas the second axis explains 15.6% and 6.9% of the fitted and total variation respectively. Plots of the two forest types are clearly separated along the first axis of the ordination plot which is correlated to the environmental and stand structural variables OC, mean H and HD.

Finally, the correlation values among the different environmental and stand structural variables, MDS1 and MDS2 of the plant diversity matrix, and woody regeneration and diversity indices matrices are shown Fig. 6. The multidimensional scaling axes generated

using the understory composition (MDS1_Under) and natural regeneration (MDS1_Reg) matrices are positively and significantly (P<0.05) correlated with the stand structural indices (except for density), soil fertility (OC, N, P and K) and soil porosity but negatively correlated with soil physical properties (clay, silt and BD), pH, EC and C/N. In addition, we found positive correlations between all diversity indices and stand structural indices (Fig. 6).

DISCUSSION

Soil properties and stand structural features between the two oak forest types

Our results highlighted differences not only in soil properties but also in forest structural features and plant diversity between our two forest types CWS (abandoned coppice with standards stands) and HF (high forests with low management intensity). Indeed, we found that the major soil nutrients (NPK), soil organic carbon, soil porosity were significantly higher in HF than in CWS whereas the bulk density (BD) was higher in CWS than in HF. Moreover, all stand descriptors and vegetation indices (except woody species density) including MI, HD, DD, TCC, BA and the mean height of the woody species were significantly higher in HF than CWS. Centuries of past management have shaped contrasted plant assemblages in the two forest types and more largely have influenced abiotic factors. It is known that plants directly modify the environment of other plants by competing for resources like water or light or by facilitative mechanisms such as amelioration of extreme temperatures or increasing resource availability such as nutrients (Caldeira et al., 2014). Moreover, trees and shrubs have indirect effects on soils through plant remains reaching the soil surface (in particular litter and root exudates) and nutrient uptake, which influence soil biogeochemical processes (Camping et al., 2002; Kooch et al., 2017; Eslaminejad et al., 2020). The higher structural and functional forest complexity found at HF seems to have enhanced litterfall inputs, increased nutrient content and soil organic matter accumulation on the forest floor (Lucas-Borja et al 2016), consequently favoring the nutrient and C cycling functions. Moreover, structural and functional forest complexity may significantly re-route vertical precipitation pathways by canopy

12

interception, throughfall and stemflow, hence clearly affecting the water regulation function (Lucas-Borja and Delgado-Baquerizo 2019). In addition, litter and dead forestry materials above the soil surface perform important ecological functions such as soil protection and nutrition and provide habitat for a large variety of organisms, ultimately contributing to soil fertility and accumulation of soil organic carbon with time (Sangha et al., 2006). Consistent with our results, Van Calster et al. (2007) showed that the conversion of coppices to high forests increased the number of species of the understory vegetation and of soil quality indicators such as nitrogen and soil moisture. Similarly, Heydari et al (2020), comparing high forests to coppice stands in western Iran, found higher amounts and more diverse inputs of litter in high forests which may generate higher quantity of nutrients favoring biomass and diversity of the soil microorganisms. In fact, high forests most often exhibited more diverse and denser woody species with thicker canopy favoring litter accumulation and flow of nutrients, explaining the more fertile soils in this type of forest (Callaway et al., 1991; Klemmedson, 1991; Heydari et al., 2020).

In contrast, in the more simple forest structures like coppices derived from traditional management, soil nutrients and organic matter accumulation are often reduced (e.g. Pyttel et al., 2015). This limited soil fertility can also be explained by the traditional coppice system including too frequent and too intense cuttings, which drastically reduce overstory cover and vegetal inputs reaching soil surface (Van Calster et al., 2008; Poeplau et al., 2011). Such activities can explain the increase of soil bulk density and porosity due to soil compaction, as well as the reduction of soil organic matter (Labelle and Jaeger, 2011; Cambi et al., 2015; Vacca et al., 2017). Moreover, the opening of the forest cover and the biomass removal in CWS have reduced the protective effect of the canopy and accelerated the topsoil erosion (Stott et al., 2001; Borrelli et al., 2017). It has also disrupted the input of organic matter (litter) (Noormets *et al*., 2015) which is the main source of soil nutrients in our systems, reduced soil fertility and accelerated carbon losses (Mallik and Hu, 1997; Vacca et al., 2017).

Effect of forest systems on diversity and composition of plant species and regeneration

In this study, we showed that the forest type (CWS or HF) resulting from contrasted management systems, has a profound influence on vegetation diversity and composition of the overstory, and on the structural characteristics of the stands such as density,

434   diameter, height and canopy. Similar results were also found in temperate forests, in

435   particular after conversion from coppices to high forests, but was more rarely described

436   in semi-arid forests. For instance, Scolastri et al. (2017) showed that the structural

437   characteristics of beech forest stands were significantly affected by silvicultural

438   management and the gradual change of coppices to high forests. Our results indicated that

439   the values of the Shannon diversity indices applied to the forest structure (i.e. using DBH

440   classes, basal area, mean height) were higher in HF than in CWS, while the tree density

441   was the highest in CWS due to the great number of sprouts in this system. This high

442   density in CWS favored the stems' competition for light and space, and over time leads

443   to a more uniform vertical structure of the CWS compared to HF (Fabbio et al., 2006).

444   Such changes illustrate that human disturbances linked to a forest management system

445   such as coppicing can deeply modify the horizontal and vertical structure of the forest as

446   shown by many previous studies (Kirby et al., 1991; Cierjacks and Hensen, 2004;

447   Bruckman et al., 2016; Manetti et al., 2020). This modification of the forest structure then

448   plays a key role in the change of the forest microclimate, soil properties and more largely

449   the future of the forest (Heydari et al., 2017 b; Košulič et al., 2016).

450   We also showed that the composition, the diversity and richness of the understory

451   vegetation including the regeneration in woody species were significantly higher in HF

452   than in CWS. Such differences between the two systems can be explained by the

453   modification of both the below-ground (soil properties) and the above-ground resources

454   due to change in the forest structure. Forest management involves a set of human activities

455   and disturbances (Van der Maarel 1993; Kulakowski et al., 2017) and is a key factor

456   affecting the environmental factors controlling changes in plant diversity. For example in

457   our study, thinning and frequent cuttings in CWS has increased light availability (Ford

458   and Newbould 1977; Strubelt et al., 2019) and access to soil water and nutrients (Parsons,

459   Knight and Miller 1994). This has favored the competitive exclusion between species and

460   has decreased species diversity (Wilson and Tilman 1993). Because different forest

461   management systems may simultaneously modulate access to different sources such as

462   light and soil nutrients, their effects on biodiversity vary from region to region and

463   according to the type of vegetation. For instance, some plant groups such as graminoids

464   respond more to management operations such as coppicing: their richness and abundance

465   can increase after exploitation operations due to the colonizing capacity of several

466   heliophilous species (Roberts and Zhu 2002; Decocq et al., 2004). Light regime is indeed

467   an important factor in changing the species composition and diversity and the greater light

availability after coppicing can efficiently limit the abundance of shade-tolerant species but facilitate the development of light-demanding species (Vild et al., 2013). The higher diversity and species richness in HF compared to CWS can also be related to the more stable canopy conditions in HF over time, i.e. more stable microclimate conditions in the forest floor favorable to shade-tolerant and vernal species (Durak 2012). Similarly, Scolastri et al. (2017) stated that HF stands can offer a wide range of light conditions that support a high plant diversity from strictly shade-tolerant to semi-heliophilous species. The higher diversity and density of woody species in the regeneration of HF can be related to the greater diversity of the overstory in woody species which can provide diverse seeds and offer suitable microhabitats for the seedlings. In contrast, the larger canopy opening in CWS, the simplification of the forest structure as well as the reduced soil fertility, are less favorable for the successful establishment of woody species regeneration (Heydari et al., 2017 a).

CONCLUSION

We compared abandoned coppice with standards stands (CWS) and high forest stands (HF) to understand whether past forest management system can have effects on the forest stand structural features, soil properties and plant diversity, and if so, in what way. Our findings highlighted not only which system has the higher soil nutrient content, soil organic matter, species richness or diversity, but also which was able to preserve the most typical understory species of the oak semiarid forest. HF offered more stable microclimatic conditions over time leading to a higher soil quality and a more diverse ecosystem than CWS. Our results provide the first insights for supporting the conversion of CWS to HF to improve species diversity and soil fertility and maintaining more stable conditions in semi-arid oak forests. In the harsh site conditions of oak forests in western Iran, the more conservative management in HF stands submitted to less frequent cuttings and subsequent disturbances than in the traditional coppicing system was more favorable for the protection of soil and vegetation diversity. This legacy of forest management is still noticeable in the forest composition, structure and soil properties after a long period of abandonment.

502

REFERENCES

504 Anderson, M., Gorley, R. and Clarke, K.P., 2008. For PRIMER: guide to software and
505 statistical methods. Primer-e, Plymouth, UK.

506 Baeten, L., Bauwens, B., De Schrijver, A., De Keersmaeker, L., Van Calster, H.,
507 Vandekerkhove, K., Roelandt, B., Beeckman, H. and Verheyen, K., 2009. Herb layer
508 changes (1954-2000) related to the conversion of coppice-with-standards forest and soil
509 acidification. Applied Vegetation Science, 12(2), pp.187-197.

510 Bartha, S., Merolli, A., Campetella, G. and Canullo, R., 2008. Changes of vascular plant
511 diversity along a chronosequence of beech coppice stands, central Apennines, Italy. Plant
512 Biosystems-An International Journal Dealing with all Aspects of Plant Biology, 142(3),
513 pp.572-583.

514 Becker, T., Spanka, J., Schröder, L. and Leuschner, C., 2017. Forty years of vegetation
515 change in former coppice-with-standards woodlands as a result of management change
516 and N deposition. Applied Vegetation Science, 20(2), pp.304-313.

517 Biˇcík, I., Jeleˇcek, L.,ˇStˇepánek, V., 2001. Land-use changes and their social
518 drivingforces in Czechia in the 19th and 20th centuries. Land Use Policy 18 (1), 65–73.

519 Blake, G.R., Hartge, K.H., 1986. Bulk density. In: Klute, A. (Ed.), Methods of
520 SoilAnalysis: Part I. physical and Mineralogy Methods. , 2nd ed. American Societyof
521 Agronomy Soil Science Society of America Madison, pp. 363–376
522 (Agronomymonograph no. 9).

523 Borrelli, P., Panagos, P., Märker, M., Modugno, S. and Schütt, B., 2017. Assessment of
524 the impacts of clear-cutting on soil loss by water erosion in Italian forests: First
525 comprehensive monitoring and modelling approach. Catena, 149, pp.770-781.

526 Bruckman, V.J., Terada, T., Fukuda, K., Yamamoto, H. and Hochbichler, E., 2016.
527 Overmature periurban Quercus–Carpinus coppice forests in Austria and Japan: a
528 comparison of carbon stocks, stand characteristics and conversion to high forest.
529 European Journal of Forest Research, 135(5), pp.857-869.

530 Byrnes, J.E., Gamfeldt, L., Isbell, F., Lefcheck, J.S., Griffin, J.N., Hector, A., Cardinale,
531 B.J., Hooper, D.U., Dee, L.E. and Emmett Duffy, J., 2014. Investigating the relationship
532 between biodiversity and ecosystem multifunctionality: challenges and solutions.
533 Methods in Ecology and Evolution, 5(2), pp.111-124.

534   Caldeira, M.C., Ibáñez, I., Nogueira, C., Bugalho, M.N., Lecomte, X., Moreira, A. and

535   Pereira, J.S., 2014. Direct and indirect effects of tree canopy facilitation in the recruitment

536   of M editerranean oaks. Journal of applied ecology, 51(2), pp.349-358.

537   Callaway, R.M., Nadkarni, N.M. and Mahall, B.E., 1991. Facilitation and interference of

538   Quercus douglasii on understory productivity in central California. Ecology, 72(4),

539   pp.1484-1499.

540   Cambi, M., Certini, G., Neri, F. and Marchi, E., 2015. The impact of heavy traffic on

541   forest soils: A review. Forest ecology and management, 338, pp.124-138.

542   Camping, T.J., Dahlgren, R.A., Tate, K.W. and Horwath, W.R., 2002. Change in soil

543   quality due to grazing and oak tree removal in California blue oak woodlands. In In:

544   Standiford, Richard B., et al, tech. editor. Proceedings of the Fifth Symposium on Oak

545   Woodlands: Oaks in California's Challenging Landscape. Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-

546   184, Albany, CA: Pacific Southwest Research Station, Forest Service, US Department of

547   Agriculture: 75-85 (Vol. 184).

548   Cierjacks, A. and Hensen, I., 2004. Variation of stand structure and regeneration of

549   Mediterranean holm oak along a grazing intensity gradient. Plant ecology, 173(2),

550   pp.215-223.

551   Clarke, K.R. and Gorley, R.N., 2006. PRIMER v6: user manual/tutorial, Primer E:

552   Plymouth. Plymouth Marine Laboratory, Plymouth, UK.

553   Clarke, K.R., 1993. Non-parametric multivariate analyses of changes in community

554   structure. Australian journal of ecology, 18(1), pp.117-143.

555   Decocq, G., Aubert, M., Dupont, F., Alard, D., Saguez, R., Wattez-Franger, A.N.N.I.E.,

556   Foucault, B.D., Delelis-Dusollier, A.N.N.I.C.K. and Bardat, J., 2004. Plant diversity in a

557   managed temperate deciduous forest: understorey response to two silvicultural systems.

558   Journal of Applied Ecology, 41(6), pp.1065-1079.

559   Della Longa, G., Boscutti, F., Marini, L. and Alberti, G., 2020. Coppicing and plant

560   diversity in a lowland wood remnant in North–East Italy. Plant Biosystems-An

561   International Journal Dealing with all Aspects of Plant Biology, 154(2), pp.173-180.

562   Dlamini, C.S., 2013. A protocol for community-based forest enterprises: The case of non-

563   timber forest products. Journal of Horticulture and Forestry, 5(1), pp.1-12.

564   Durak, T., 2012. Changes in diversity of the mountain beech forest herb layer as a

565   function of the forest management method. Forest Ecology and Management, 276,

566   pp.154-164.

567 Eslaminejad, P., Heydari, M., Kakhki, F.V., Mirab-balou, M., Omidipour, R., Muñoz-
568 Rojas, M. and Lucas-Borja, M.E., 2020. Plant species and season influence soil
569 physicochemical properties and microbial function in a semi-arid woodland ecosystem.
570 Plant and Soil, 456(1), pp.43-59.

571 Fabbio, G. and Amorini, E., 2006. Conversion to high forest and natural pattern into
572 ageing Quercus cerris coppices. Results from 35 years of monitoring. The Caselli site
573 (Tyrrhenian coast-Tuscany). From Italian. Ann Ist Sper Selv, 33, pp.79-104.

574 Ford, E.D. and Newbould, P.J., 1977. The biomass and production of ground vegetation
575 and its relation to tree cover through a deciduous woodland cycle. The Journal of Ecology,
576 pp.201-212.

577 Gondard, H., Romane, F., Santa Regina, I. and Leonardi, S., 2006. Forest management
578 and plant species diversity in chestnut stands of three Mediterranean areas. In Forest
579 Diversity and Management (pp. 69-82). Springer, Dordrecht.

580 Govaert, S., Meeussen, C., Vanneste, T., Bollmann, K., Brunet, J., Cousins, S.A.,
581 Diekmann, M., Graae, B.J., Hedwall, P.O., Heinken, T. and Iacopetti, G., 2020. Edge
582 influence on understorey plant communities depends on forest management. Journal of
583 Vegetation Science, 31(2), pp.281-292.

584 Heydari, M., Eslaminejad, P., Kakhki, F.V., Mirab-balou, M., Omidipour, R., Prévosto,
585 B., Kooch, Y. and Lucas-Borja, M.E., 2020 a. Soil quality and mesofauna diversity
586 relationship are modulated by woody species and seasonality in semiarid oak forest.
587 Forest Ecology and Management, 473, p.118332.

588 Heydari, M., Prévosto, B., Naji, H.R., Mehrabi, A.A. and Pothier, D., 2017 a. Influence
589 of soil properties and burial depth on Persian oak (*Quercus brantii* Lindl.) establishment
590 in different microhabitats resulting from traditional forest practices. European Journal of
591 Forest Research, 136(2), pp.287-305.

592 Heydari, M., Prévosto, B., Abdi, T., Mirzaei, J., Mirab-Balou, M., Rostami, N., Khosravi,
593 M. and Pothier, D., 2017 b. Establishment of oak seedlings in historically disturbed sites:
594 Regeneration success as a function of stand structure and soil characteristics. Ecological
595 Engineering, 107, pp.172-182.

596 Kirby, K.J., Buckley, G.P. and Mills, J., 2017. Biodiversity implications of coppice
597 decline, transformations to high forest and coppice restoration in British woodland. Folia
598 Geobotanica, 52(1), pp.5-13.

599   Kirby, K.J., Webster, S.D. and Antczak, A., 1991. Effects of forest management on stand

600   structure and the quantity of fallen dead wood: some British and Polish examples. Forest

601   Ecology and Management, 43(1-2), pp.167-174.

602   Klemmedson, J.O., 1991. Oak influence on nutrient availability in pine forests of central

603   Arizona. Soil Science Society of America Journal, 55(1), pp.248-253.

604   Kooch, Y., Tarighat, F.S. and Hosseini, S.M., 2017. Tree species effects on soil chemical,

605   biochemical and biological features in mixed Caspian lowland forests. Trees, 31(3),

606   pp.863-872.

607   Košulič, O., Michalko, R. and Hula, V., 2016. Impact of canopy openness on spider

608   communities: implications for conservation management of formerly coppiced oak

609   forests. PLoS One, 11(2), p.e0148585.

610   Kulakowski, D., Seidl, R., Holeksa, J., Kuuluvainen, T., Nagel, T.A., Panayotov, M.,

611   Svoboda, M., Thorn, S., Vacchiano, G., Whitlock, C. and Wohlgemuth, T., 2017. A walk

612   on the wild side: disturbance dynamics and the conservation and management of

613   European mountain forest ecosystems. Forest ecology and management, 388, pp.120-131.

614   Labelle, E.R. and Jaeger, D., 2011. Soil compaction caused by cut-to-length forest

615   operations and possible short-term natural rehabilitation of soil density. Soil Science

616   Society of America Journal, 75(6), pp.2314-2329.

617   Laganière, J., Paré, D., Bergeron, Y. and Chen, H.Y., 2012. The effect of boreal forest

618   composition on soil respiration is mediated through variations in soil temperature and C

619   quality. Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 53, pp.18-27.

620   Lo Monaco, A., Todaro, L., Sarlatto, M., Spina, R., Calienno, L., Picchio, R., 2011.

621   Effectof moisture on physical parameters of timber from Turkey oak (Quercus cerrisL.)

622   coppice in Central Italy. For. Stud. China 13 (4), 276–284.

623   Lucas-Borja, M., Hedo, J., Cerdá, A., Candel-Pérez, D. and Viñegla, B. 2016. Unravelling

624   the importance of forest age stand and forest structure driving microbiological soil

625   properties, enzymatic activities and soil nutrients content in Mediterranean Spanish black

626   pine (Pinus nigra Ar. ssp. salzmannii) forest. Sci Total Environ, 562, 145-154.

627   Lucas-Borja, M.E. and Delgado-Baquerizo, M., 2019. Plant diversity and soil

628   stoichiometry regulates the changes in multifunctionality during pine temperate forest

629   secondary succession. Science of The Total Environment, 697, p.134204.

630   Lucas-Borja, M.E., Candel-Pérez, D., Tíscar, P.A., Prévosto, B. and Hedo, J., 2017. Pinus

631   nigra Arn. ssp salzmannii early recruitment and initial seedling growth in warmer and

632   drier locations: the role of seed and soil provenance. Plant Ecology, 218(6), pp.761-772.

633 Lucas-Borja, M.E., Heydari, M., Miralles, I., Zema, D.A. and Manso, R., 2020. Effects
634 of Skidding Operations after Tree Harvesting and Soil Scarification by Felled Trees on
635 Initial Seedling Emergence of Spanish Black Pine (Pinus nigra Arn. ssp. salzmannii).
636 Forests, 11(7), p.767.

637 Magagnotti, N., Schweier, J., Spinelli, R., Tolosana, E., Jylhä, P., Sopushynskyy, I.,
638 Otepka, P., Nestorovski, L., Costa, M., Rodriguez, A. and Rossney, D., 2018. Coppice
639 products. Coppice Forests in Europe, p.78.

640 Mallik, A.U. and Hu, D., 1997. Soil respiration following site preparation treatments in
641 boreal mixedwood forest. Forest Ecology and Management, 97(3), pp.265-275.

642 Manetti, M.C., Becagli, C., Bertini, G., Cantiani, P., Marchi, M., Pelleri, F., Sansone, D.
643 and Fabbio, G., 2020. The conversion into high forest of Turkey oak coppice stands:
644 methods, silviculture and perspectives. iForest-Biogeosciences and Forestry, 13(4),
645 p.309.

646 Marchi, E., Picchio, R., Mederski, P.S., Vusić, D., Perugini, M. and Venanzi, R., 2016.
647 Impact of silvicultural treatment and forest operation on soil and regeneration in
648 Mediterranean Turkey oak (*Quercus cerris* L.) coppice with standards. Ecological
649 engineering, 95, pp.475-484.

650 Martin, Š., Daniel, V., Aytekin, E. and Radim, M., 2015. The effect of coppice
651 management on the structure, tree growth and soil nutrients in temperate Turkey. Journal
652 of Forest Science, 61(1), pp.27-34.

653 Mei, G., Pesaresi, S., Corti, G., Cocco, S., Colpi, C. and Taffetani, F., 2020. Changes in
654 vascular plant species composition, top-soil and seed-bank along coppice rotation in an
655 Ostrya carpinifolia forest. Plant Biosystems-An International Journal Dealing with all
656 Aspects of Plant Biology, 154(2), pp.259-268.

657 Modrý M., Hubený D., Rejsek K., 2004. Differential response of naturally regenerated
658 European shade tolerant species to soil type and light availability, Forest Ecology and
659 Management, 188: 185-195.

660 Müllerová, J., Hédl, R. and Szabó, P., 2015. Coppice abandonment and its implications
661 for species diversity in forest vegetation. Forest Ecology and Management, 343, pp.88-
662 100.

663 Nave, L.E., Vance, E.D., Swanston, C.W. and Curtis, P.S., 2010. Harvest impacts on soil
664 carbon storage in temperate forests. Forest Ecology and Management, 259(5), pp.857-
665 866.

666 Noormets, A., Epron, D., Domec, J.C., McNulty, S.G., Fox, T., Sun, G. and King, J.S.,
667 2015. Effects of forest management on productivity and carbon sequestration: A review
668 and hypothesis. Forest Ecology and Management, 355, pp.124-140.

669 Packham, J.R., Harding, D.J.L., Hilton, G.M., Stuttart, R.A., 1992. Functional Ecology
670 of Woodlands and Forests. Chapman and Hall, London.

671 Poeplau, C., Don, A., Vesterdal, L., Leifeld, J., Van Wesemael, B.A.S., Schumacher, J.
672 and Gensior, A., 2011. Temporal dynamics of soil organic carbon after land-use change
673 in the temperate zone–carbon response functions as a model approach. Global Change
674 Biology, 17(7), pp.2415-2427.

675 Pommerening, A., 2002. Approaches to quantifying forest structures. Forestry 3,305–324.

676 Pyttel, P.L., Köhn, M. and Bauhus, J., 2015. Effects of different harvesting intensities on
677 the macro nutrient pools in aged oak coppice forests. Forest Ecology and Management,
678 349, pp.94-105.

679 Riccioli, F., Fratini, R., Marone, E., Fagarazzi, C., Calderisi, M. and Brunialti, G., 2020.
680 Indicators of sustainable forest management to evaluate the socio-economic functions of
681 coppice in Tuscany, Italy. Socio-Economic Planning Sciences, 70, p.100732.

682 Roberts, M.R. and Zhu, L., 2002. Early response of the herbaceous layer to harvesting in
683 a mixed coniferous–deciduous forest in New Brunswick, Canada. Forest Ecology and
684 Management, 155(1-3), pp.17-31.

685 Sangha, K.K., Jalota, R.K. and Midmore, D.J., 2006. Litter production, decomposition
686 and nutrient release in cleared and uncleared pasture systems of central Queensland,
687 Australia. Journal of Tropical Ecology, pp.177-189.

688 Scolastri, A., Cancellieri, L., Iocchi, M. and Cutini, M., 2017. Old coppice versus high
689 forest: the impact of beech forest management on plant species diversity in central
690 Apennines (Italy). Journal of Plant Ecology, 10(2), pp.271-280.

691 Soil Survey Staff, 2014. Keys to Soil Taxonomy, 12th edn. USDA Natural Resources
692 Conservation Service, Washington, DC.

693 Stott, T., Leeks, G., Marks, S. and Sawyer, A., 2001. Environmentally sensitive plot-scale
694 timber harvesting: impacts on suspended sediment, bedload and bank erosion dynamics.
695 Journal of environmental management, 63(1), pp.3-25.

696 Strubelt, I., Diekmann, M., Griese, D. and Zacharias, D., 2019. Inter-annual variation in
697 species composition and richness after coppicing in a restored coppice-with-standards
698 forest. Forest Ecology and Management, 432, pp.132-139.

699 Tardós, P., Lucas-Borja, M.E., Beltrán, M., Onkelinx, T. and Piqué, M., 2019. Composite

700 low thinning and slash burning treatment enhances initial Spanish black pine seedling

701 recruitment. Forest Ecology and Management, 433, pp.1-12.

702   Vacca, A., Aru, F. and Ollesch, G., 2017. Short-term Impact of Coppice Management on

703 Soil in a Quercus ilex l. Stand of Sardinia. Land Degradation & Development, 28(2),

704 pp.553-565.

705 Valipour, A., Plieninger, T., Shakeri, Z., Ghazanfari, H., Namiranian, M. and Lexer, M.J.,

706 2014. Traditional silvopastoral management and its effects on forest stand structure in

707 northern Zagros, Iran. Forest ecology and management, 327, pp.221-230.

708 Van Calster, H., Baeten, L., De Schrijver, A., De Keersmaeker, L., Rogister, J.E.,

709 Verheyen, K. and Hermy, M., 2007. Management driven changes (1967–2005) in soil

710 acidity and the understorey plant community following conversion of a coppice-with-

711 standards forest. Forest Ecology and Management, 241(1-3), pp.258-271.

712 Van Calster, H., Baeten, L., Verheyen, K., De Keersmaeker, L., Dekeyser, S., Rogister,

713 J.E. and Hermy, M., 2008. Diverging effects of overstorey conversion scenarios on the

714 understorey vegetation in a former coppice-with-standards forest. Forest Ecology and

715 Management, 256(4), pp.519-528.

716 van der Maarel, E., 1993. Some remarks on disturbance and its relations to diversity and

717 stability. Journal of Vegetation Science, 4(6), pp.733-736.

718 Venanzi, R., Picchio, R., Grigolato, S. and Latterini, F., 2019. Soil and forest regeneration

719 after different extraction methods in coppice forests. Forest Ecology and Management,

720 454, p.117666.

721 Venanzi, R., Picchio, R., Grigolato, S. and Latterini, F., 2019. Soil and forest regeneration

722 after different extraction methods in coppice forests. Forest Ecology and Management,

723 454, p.117666.

724 Venanzi, R., Picchio, R., Spinelli, R. and Grigolato, S., 2020. Soil Disturbance and

725 Recovery after Coppicing a Mediterranean Oak Stand: The Effects of Silviculture and

726 Technology. Sustainability, 12(10), p.4074.

727 Vild, O., Roleček, J., Hédl, R., Kopecký, M. and Utinek, D., 2013. Experimental

728 restoration of coppice-with-standards: Response of understorey vegetation from the

729 conservation perspective. Forest Ecology and Management, 310, pp.234-241.

730 Wäldchen, J., Schulze, E.D., Schöning, I., Schrumpf, M. and Sierra, C., 2013. The

731 influence of changes in forest management over the past 200 years on present soil organic

732 carbon stocks. Forest Ecology and Management, 289, pp.243-254.

733 Waring, B.G., Adams, R., Branco, S. and Powers, J.S., 2016. Scale-dependent variation
734 in nitrogen cycling and soil fungal communities along gradients of forest composition
735 and age in regenerating tropical dry forests. New Phytologist, 209(2), pp.845-854.

736 Williamson, J.R. and Neilsen, W.A., 2000. The influence of forest site on rate and extent
737 of soil compaction and profile disturbance of skid trails during ground-based harvesting.
738 Canadian Journal of Forest Research, 30(8), pp.1196-1205.

739 Wilson, S. D. and Tilman, D. 1993. Plant competition and resource availability in
740 response to disturbance and fertilization. Ecology 74: 599–611.

741 Yücesan, Z., Hacisalihoglu, S., Kezik, U. and Karadag, H., 2019. Effects of canopy on
742 soil erosion and carbon sequestration in a Pedunculate oak (Quercus robur L. subsp. robur
743 L.) coppice stand during the conversion process into high forest. Austrian Journal of
744 Forest Science, 136(1), pp.45-66.

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

Figure 1. Location of study area in south-western Iran

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787

788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798

Figure 2. Ordination by multidimensional scaling (MDS) of understory vegetation composition (HF and CWS) showing the environmental and stand structural vectors proportional to the strength of the correlation with the axes. TCC: total canopy cover, BA: basal area, HD: Height differentiation, DD: diameter differentiation, MI: mingling index, Density: tree density; mean H: mean height of woody species, P: available phosphorus, K: available potassium, OC: organic carbon, EC: electrical conductivity, N: total nitrogen, C/N: carbon/nitrogen, BD: bulk density.

Figure 3. MDS showing the composition of the regeneration in woody species (HF and

CWS) and the environmental and stand structural variables.

812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826

827

828

Figure 4. Distance-based redundancy analysis (DbRDA) plot t for understorey vegetation composition showing the distribution of the plots of the two systems (HF, CWS) according to the normalized value of the soil organic carbon (OC).

832

833

834

835

836 **Figure 5**. DbRDA ordination plot for composition of the woody regeneration. The
837 environmental and stand structural vectors are indicated in the factorial map as follows:
838 mean H (mean height of woody species); OC (soilorganic carbon) and HD (height
839 differentiation index).

840

841

Figure 6. Map of the correlations among the environmental and stand structural variables, the MDS1 and MDS2 of the plant diversity matrix and of the woody regeneration and biodiversity indices matrices. TCC: total canopy cover, BA: basal area, HD: Height differentiation, DD: diameter differentiation, MI: mingling index, Density: tree density; mean H: mean height of woody species, P: available phosphorus, K: available potassium, OC: organic carbon, EC: electrical conductivity, N: total nitrogen, C/N: carbon/nitrogen, BD: bulk density.

843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859

860 **Table 1**. Comparison of mean (± standard error) soil properties and stand structural
861 features between high forest (HF) and coppice-with-standards (CWS).

	Variables	HF	CWS	t-value
Soil properties	OC (%)	2.58 (0.007)	1.61 (0.004)	112.90***
	Ntot (%)	0.28 (0.001)	0.15 (0.002)	68.94***
	Pava (ppm)	22.82 (0.344)	15.47 (0.129)	19.97***
	Kava (ppm)	314.17 (0.604)	289.93 (0.818)	23.83***
	pH	7.31 (0.006)	7.39 (0.022)	-3.74***
	EC (ds.m-1)	0.36 (0.005)	0.49 (0.003)	-22.74***
	C/N	9.46 (0.103)	10.76 (0.114)	-8.46***
	Sand (%)	41.87 (0.164)	31.23 (0.689)	15.01***
	Silt (%)	29.00 (0.179)	34.63 (0.584)	-9.22***
	Clay (%)	29.13 (0.133)	34.13 (0.587)	-8.31***
	BD (g m^{-3})	1.29 (0.004)	1.39 (0.002)	-21.69***
	Porosity (%)	51.50 (0.215)	47.66 (0.056)	17.31***
Stand structural	MI	0.73 (0.004)	0.13 (0.002)	10.75***
	HD	0.66 (0.002)	0.33 (0.001)	13.03***
	DD	0.64 (0.024)	0.34 (0.021)	9.14***
	TCC (m^2)	234.26 (4.875)	117.32 (2.802)	20.79***
	BA (m^2 ha^{-1})	11.73 (0.350)	5.69 (0.160)	15.67***
	Density (N ha^{-1})	274.07 (4.823)	338.97 (7.074)	-7.58***
	Mean Height of woody species (m)	2.77 (0.053)	1.68 (0.044)	15.73***

862 ***** p < 0.001**

863

864

865

866

867

868

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

880

881 **Table 2.** Mean values (± standard error) of the diversity indices of the understory

882 vegetation and woody regeneration in each forest type.

	Vegetation		
Diversity indices	**HF**	**CWS**	**P-value**
Margalef's richness	2.3(0.1)	1.4(0.1)	<0.001**
Shannon's diversity	1.5(0.05)	0.9(0.05)	<0.001**
Simpson's diversity	0.9(0.02)	0.7(0.02)	<0.001**
Pielou's evenness	0.9(0.01)	0.8(0.01)	<0.001**
	Regeneration		
Diversity indices	**HF**	**CWS**	**P-value**
Margalef's richness	1.16(0.08)	0.62(0.12)	0.001**
Shannon's diversity	0.88(0.06)	0.40(0.07)	<0.001**
Simpson's diversity	0.45(0.02)	0.26(0.05)	<0.001**
Pielou's evenness	0.67(0.02)	0.47(0.08)	0.03*

883 (**P < 0.01; *P < 0.05)

884

885

886

887

888

889

890

891

892

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905   **Table 3.** Mean density values (and standard error) (No. in 100 m^2) of the regeneration of

906   the woody species in both forest types.

Species	HF	CWS	P-value
Quercus brantii	8.32 (0.58)	4.1 (0.42)	<0.001**
Pistacia atlantica	0.51 (0.11)	0 (0)	<0.001**
Acer monspessulanum	0.46 (0.11)	0 (0)	<0.001**
Crataegus azarolus	1.00 (0.15)	0.53(0.10)	<0.001**
Amygdalus orientalis	0.30 (0.08)	0(0)	<0.001**
Amygdalus scoparia	0.60 (0.12)	0.46(0.10)	<0.001**
Amygdalus lycioides	0.66 (0.12)	0.23 (0.09)	<0.001**
All species	11.90 (0.68)	4.26 (0.34)	<0.001**

907   (**P < 0.01)

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

922

923

924

925

926

927

928

929 **Table 4.** Best DistLM model for predicting understorey plant diversity using all
930 environmental and stand structural variables (R^2=0.39).

Variable	AICc	Pseudo-F	P	Prop.	Cumul.	res.df
+OC	431.49	33.301	0.001	0.36474	0.36474	58

931 OC: organic carbon

932

933 **Table 5.** Best DistLM models for predicting the composition of the woody regeneration
934 using the environmental and stand structural variables. (R^2=0.44).

Variable	AICc	Pseudo-F	P	Prop.	Cumul.	res.df
+OC	398.6	34.235	0.001	0.37117	0.37117	58
+mean H	396.65	4.107	0.011	4.23E-02	0.41343	57
+HD	395.51	3.2981	0.03	3.26E-02	0.44606	56

935 OC: organic carbon, mean H: mean height of woody species, HD: height differentiation
936 index

937

938

939

940

941

942

943

944

945