Full Length Research Paper

# Predictor variables for soil organic carbon contents in the Miombowoodlands ecosystem of Kitonga forest reserve, Tanzania

<sup>\*1</sup>Shelukindo H. B, <sup>1</sup>Semu E., <sup>1</sup>Msanya B. M., <sup>2</sup>Singh B. R. and <sup>3</sup>Munishi P. K. T

<sup>1</sup>Department of Soil Science, Faculty of Agriculture, Sokoine University of Agriculture, P.O. Box 3008, Morogoro, Tanzania.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Environmental Sciences, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, P.O. Box 1432, Ås – Norway. <sup>3</sup>Department of Forest Biology, Faculty of Forestry and Nature Conservation, Sokoine University of Agriculture, P.O. Box 3010, Morogoro, Tanzania.

#### Accepted 29 May, 2014

Few studies have established the variables which adequately predict SOC storage in the Miombo woodlands. Multiple regression analysis was used to establish the variables which could predict SOC contents in dominant soils of the Miombo woodlands of Kitonga Forest Reserve, Tanzania. Thirty soil minipits located at different elevations across a topographical gradient were selected, geo-referenced, excavated and samples from the natural horizons were collected for physico-chemical analysis. A total of 85 samples were collected, each representing a natural soil horizon. The results indicated that total nitrogen (TN), (P< 0.001,  $R^2 = 0.97$ ) and TN in combination with calcium (Ca) (P< 0.001,  $R^2 = 0.99$ ) were important predictor variables of SOC contents. The combination of cation exchange capacity, Zinc, Copper, clay and iron together with TN and Ca predicted well the SOC contents (P< 0.001,  $R^2 = 0.99$ ). Considering time and cost implications for field and laboratory analysis in predicting SOC stocks, the combination of TN and Ca that predicted the SOC contents by 99% provided equally strong prediction when compared to the combination of all the variables. Thus, proper land management strategies which enhance conservation of TN and Ca in concert would provide adequate prediction of SOC contents in soils.

**Key words:** Miombo woodlands, predictor variables, soil organic carbon contents, multiple regressions, Kitonga Forest Reserve, Tanzania.

### INTRODUCTION

It is recognized that forest ecosystems, globally store about 40% of organic carbon, with 11% of the carbon being stored in forest soils (Negi *et al.*, 2013; Yuan *et al.*, 2013). As the largest reservoir of terrestrial carbon, soils play a role in the regulation of global warming and greenhouse gas effects (Aticho, 2013; Stockmann *et al.*, 2013; Jandl *et al.*, 2014). Globally, soils store about 1.5 x  $10^{12}$  tons of carbon (organic and inorganic), of which about 1.1 x  $10^{12}$  tons are found in forest soils (Aticho, 2013; Negi *et al.*, 2013). Due to the relatively long residence times provided by the humic substances found in the SOC, soils are a potentially important long term natural sink of carbon (Lal, 2009; Bruun *et al.*, 2010; Schmidt *et al.*, 2011; Guimaraes *et al.*, 2013), thus contributing to climate change regulation.

The amounts of SOC storage across a landscape are variable among soil types, elevation, slope position, soil texture, site characteristics, soil depth, vegetation types and climate (Lal, 2005; Attua, 2009; Aticho, 2013; Hoffmann *et al.*, 2014). Due to large spatial variations of SOC contents across landscapes, assessing the current state of SOC, especially for large tracts of land, is costly and time consuming (Jha *et al.*, 2014; Nocita *et al.*, 2014). Few studies exist on the identification of variables that are likely to influence the stocks of SOC using multiple regression models (Meersmans *et al.*, 2008; Attua, 2009; Nocita *et al.*, 2014). Understanding the mec-

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author. E-mail: hbashelu@yahoo.com

hanisms of, and the variables influencing SOC dynamics in Miombo woodland soils is important to identifying and enhancing natural sinks for C sequestration to mitigate the challenges of climate change.

The practice of identifying few variables that predict SOC stocks optimally, cost effective and time efficient would enhance the process of designing management strategies to increase SOC storage to mitigate the effects of, and to adapt to, climate change. This is important within the Miombo woodlands ecosystem, which covers about 32 million hectares, or 93% of the total forested land area and about 40% of total land, in Tanzania. Such adaptation would enhance continued provision of diverse ecosystem services to support livelihoods (Nshubemuki and Mbwambo, 2007; FAO, 2009; Woollen et al., 2012). Thus, identifying a minimum set of variables that could accurately predict SOC stocks in a timely and resourceefficient manner would constitute a substantial contribution to new knowledge in this branch of science.

The overall aim of the study reported here was to identify variables which determine predictor variables of SOC contents in the dominant soil types in the Kitonga Forest Reserve (KFR), Tanzania, and select the cost effective and time saving variables which could predict the SOC contents optimally. The results would provide for extrapolation to other areas with similar soil types and similar ecological conditions. The working hypothesis of the study was that linkages between C storage and predictor variables influencing SOC in the identified soil types could be used to explain carbon stocks in other soils under similar ecological conditions.

The data obtained would provide vital information on soil carbon stocks predictor variables in Miombo woodlands in the view point of saving financial resources and time. This would be of help to policy makers and other stakeholders in designing interventions to reduce deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+), and enhance sustainable SOC storage in soils as a result of improved soil/land management practices.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

### **Study Site**

Pertinent features of the KFR ( $07^{\circ}35' - 07^{\circ}43'S$ ; and  $37^{\circ}07' - 37^{\circ}10'E$ ) in Kilolo District, Iringa Region, Tanzania, are summarized in Table 1. The area covers 52 km<sup>2</sup> and consists of moderate to very steep slopes, with altitude ranging from 660-1880 m above sea level. Cambisols (Inceptisols) and Fluvisols (Entisols) in the medium to steep slopes and Leptosols (Entisols) in the lower slopes are the dominant soil types of the area (Shelukindo *et al.*, 2014). Climatic data from 1981 to 2012 which shows the monthly maximum, minimum and mean temperatures, monthly rainfall and mean annual rainfall have been addressed by Shelukindo *et al.* (2014).

The dominant vegetation types across the study area are also shown in Table 1.

### Sampling Procedure

A systematic sampling method (line transect) was employed to collect soil samples by establishing plots across different elevations. All plots were located on welldrained soils across elevation gradients, taking into consideration the aspect factor.

### Soil Sampling

Within each dominant soil type a 20 x 20 square m plot was set out, and partitioned into four 10 m by 10 m quadrants. In each quadrant of 10 m by 10 m, one point was randomly selected for collecting soil samples. Soil samples from these points were collected from excavated natural horizons to a limiting layer and soils from similar horizon from the four sampled quadrant mini-pits were mixed to obtain composite samples for the different horizons. Such 20 m x 20 m square plots were replicated three times. Sub-samples from each natural horizon were mixed together to make bulk samples of about 2 kg for physical and chemical analysis in the laboratory.

### Soil Analysis

In the laboratory, soil samples were air dried to constant weight, ground and sieved through a 2 mm sieve to get the fine earth fraction ready for laboratory analysis. The bulk density was determined using the core method (Black and Hartge, 1986), and texture was determined by the hydrometer method (Day, 1965). Organic carbon was determined by the wet oxidation method (Nelson and Sommers, 1982). Total N was determined using the micro-Kjeldahl digestion-distillation method as described Bremner and Mulvaney (1982). by Extractable phosphorus was determined using filtrates extracted by the Bray and Kurtz-1 method (Bray and Kurtz, 1945) and determined by spectrophotometer (Watanabe and Olsen, 1965). The exchangeable bases (Ca<sup>2+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup>, Na<sup>+</sup> and K<sup>+</sup>) were determined by atomic absorption spectrophotometer (Thomas, 1982). The micronutrients Fe, Mn, Zn and Cu were extracted using buffered 0.005M DTPA (Diethylene triamine pentaacetic acid) (Lindsay and Norvell, 1978) and their concentrations determined by an Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer (AAS) (UNICAM 919 model. The SOC stocks were calculated based on the formula given by Spiota and Sharma (2013):

 $SOC_{st} = \% SOC/100 \times BD \times D \times 100$ 

where:  $SOC_{st}$  is the soil organic carbon stocks (Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup>), SOC is the soil organic carbon concentration (%), BD

 Table 1. Site characteristics of Kitonga Forest Reserve.

| Item<br>Location                          | Description/Value<br>Kilolo Disrtict, Iringa Region            |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Latitude/Longitude                        | 07°35' - 07°43' S - 37°07' - 37°10' E                          |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Altitude (masl)                           | 660- 1880  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean Annual Rainfall (mm)                 | 540- 734   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual mean Temperature (°C)              | 12.0 - 29.0  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Size of the study area (km <sup>2</sup> ) | 52   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parent material                           | In situ weathering of biotitic gneiss and muscovite quartz     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Soil type                               | Cambisols, Fluvisols, Leptosols                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sand (%) (surface horizon)                | 57 (Cambisols) - 85 (Fluvisols and Cambisols)                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Silt (%) (surface horizon)                | 4.6 (Leptosols and Cambisols – 10.6 (Fluvisols)                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clay (%) (surface horizon)                | 10.3 (Fluvisols and Cambisols – 34.3 (Cambisols)               |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bulk density (g/cm) (surface horizon)     | 1.0 (Leptosols) - 1.23 (Fluvisols)                             |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pH (surface horizon)                      | 5.1 (Fluvisols and Cambisols) - 6.2 (Fluvisols)                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOC (%) (surface horizon)                 | 0.4 (Cambisols and Fluvisols) – 4.4 (Leptosols)                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dominant trees spps.                      | Brachystegia, Julbernardia, Diplorhynchus and<br>Condylocarpon |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dominant grasses                          | Andropogon, Heteropogon  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dominant shrubs                           | Fadogia spp.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dominant herbs                            | Commelina africana   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * FAO classification system               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

is the bulk density (g cm<sup>-3</sup>), D is the horizon thickness (cm) and 100 is the multiplication factor to convert the SOC from g cm<sup>-2</sup> to Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup>. The carbon stocks in each dominant soil type were obtained by the summation of C stocks of each natural soil horizon to the soil depth of 60 cm.

#### Statistical Analysis Pearson's correlation analysis

Pearson correlation (r) is a measure of the linear correlation between the SOC (%) (dependent variable, Y) and other variables (independent variables,  $\chi_n$ ), and has a value between +1 and -1 inclusive. Correlation value of 1 is total positive correlation, 0 is no correlation, and -1 is total negative correlation. These correlations are used to measure the degree of linear dependence and the strength of the relationship between variables (Kinnear and Gray, 1999; Attua, 2009).

All the soil variables (TN, Ca, CEC, Cu, Zn, Fe Mg, Mn, K, P, K, % clay, % silt, % sand and elevation) were correlated with SOC using Pearson's correlation analysis, of the model:

$$\begin{array}{c} r = & n \sum xy - (\sum x) (\sum y) \\ \text{where:} & n (\sum x^2) - (\sum x)^2 \sqrt{n(\sum y^2) - (\sum y)^2} & \text{on} \\ \text{x: Pre} & n (\sum x^2) - (\sum x)^2 \sqrt{n(\sum y^2) - (\sum y)^2} & \text{on} \\ \text{scation} & \text{i.e. TN,} \\ \text{ie various} \\ \text{chemical elements.} \end{array}$$

y: Predicted SOC content of a soil (dependent variable) n: the number of pairs of data (x, y).  $\Sigma$ : summation sign.

The variables correlated with SOC would be used in stepwise multiple regression analysis for predicting the SOC contents. Bryman and Cramer (1997) and Kinnear and Gray (1999) similarly used Pearson's correlation matrix when sorting out suitable predictor variables for regression analysis, as well as finding inter-correlated variables to be considered in regression analysis.

## Linear regression analysis between SOC contents and individual predictor variables

Potential predictor variables, that is, the different soil properties, in attempts at predicting SOC contents, were

Table 2. Pearson correlation matrix for variables which contribute to SOC.

| Variable  | SOC                | CEC               | TN                | <b>C</b> 2           | Broy 1 D            | K                   | Ma                 | Na                 | Mn                | Cu                 | Zn                 | Fe      | Sand    | Clav   | Cil+  | Elevation |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------|---------|--------|-------|-----------|
|           |                    | UEU               | IIN               | Са                   | Bray-1 P            | N                   | Mg                 | ina                |                   | Cu                 | 211                | LG      | Sand    | Clay   | Silt  | Lievalion |
| SOC       | 1                  |                   |                   |                      |                     |                     |                    |                    |                   |                    |                    |         |         |        |       |           |
| CEC       | 0.97**             | 1                 |                   |                      |                     |                     |                    |                    |                   |                    |                    |         |         |        |       |           |
| TN        | 0.99**             | 0.96**            | 1                 |                      |                     |                     |                    |                    |                   |                    |                    |         |         |        |       |           |
| Ca        | 0.99**             | 0.97**            | 0.99**            | 1                    |                     |                     |                    |                    |                   |                    |                    |         |         |        |       |           |
| Bray-1 P  | 0.80**             | 0.78**            | 0.82**            | 0.78**               | 1                   |                     |                    |                    |                   |                    |                    |         |         |        |       |           |
| К         | 0.83**             | 0.85**            | 0.83**            | 0.79**               | 0.81**              | 1                   |                    |                    |                   |                    |                    |         |         |        |       |           |
| Mg        | 0.94**             | 0.97**            | 0.93*             | 0.95**               | 0.65**              | 0.79**              | 1                  |                    |                   |                    |                    |         |         |        |       |           |
| Na        | 0.18 <sup>ns</sup> | 0.23*             | 0.2*              | 0.26*                | 0.27*               | - 0.1 <sup>ns</sup> | 0.19 <sup>ns</sup> | 1                  |                   |                    |                    |         |         |        |       |           |
| Mn        | 0.82**             | 0.73**            | 0.85**            | 0.84*                | 0.64**              | 0.68*               | 0.75**             | 0.05 <sup>ns</sup> | 1                 |                    |                    |         |         |        |       |           |
| Cu        | 0.91**             | 0.91**            | 0.91**            | 0.92**               | 0.69**              | 0.67**              | 0.92**             | 0.34**             | 0.71**            | 1                  |                    |         |         |        |       |           |
| Zn        | 0.97**             | 0.96**            | 0.80**            | 0.98**               | 0.80**              | 0.77**              | 0.96**             | 0.27*              | 0.75**            | 0.97**             | 1                  |         |         |        |       |           |
| Fe        | 0.97**             |                   | 0.98**            | 0.98**               | 0.89**              | 0.77                | 0.93**             | 0.17 <sup>ns</sup> | 0.71**            | 0.88**             | 0.96**             | 1       |         |        |       |           |
| Sand      | - 0.37**           | - 0.5**           | - 0.36**          | - 0.35**             | - 0.15 <sup>n</sup> | - 0.53**            | -0.42**            | - 0.21*            | - 0.59**          | - 0.48**           | 0.41**             | - 0.26* | 1       |        |       |           |
| Clay      | 0.44**             |                   | 0.44**            | 0.42**               | 0.18*               | 0.52**              | 0.48**             | 0.30**             | 0.64**            | 0.58**             | 0.5**              | 0.32**  | 0 00++  | 1      |       |           |
| Silt      | 0.63**             | 0.75**            |                   | 0.6**                | 0.33**              | 0.76**              | 0.67**             | 0.08 <sup>ns</sup> | 0.63**            | 0.69**             |                    | 0.52**  | 0.87**  | 0.88** | 1     |           |
| Elevation |                    | 0.07 <sup>n</sup> | 0.02 <sup>n</sup> | - 0.007 <sup>n</sup> | 0.01 <sup>n</sup>   | 0.23*               | 0.04 <sup>ns</sup> | - 0.22*            | 0.12 <sup>n</sup> | -0.04 <sup>n</sup> | -0.01 <sup>n</sup> |         | - 0.3** | 0.24 * | 0.27* | 1         |

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

\*\* Correlation is significant at 0.01 level

<sup>n</sup> No correlation

subjected to regression analysis to study their individual contribution in predicting SOC, as indicated by R<sup>2</sup> values. The linear regression model used was:

 $Y_{i} = \beta_{0} + \beta_{1}X_{i} + \in, \text{ for } i = 1, 2, ..., n.$ 

The model is valid for all n pairs of observations (X1, Y1), (X2, Y2)...... (Xn, Yn)

where: Yi = Predicted SOC content of a soil (dependent variable) Xi: Predictor variable (Independent variable), i.e. TN, cation exchange capacity (CEC), and various chemical elements.

 $\beta_0$ : = Intercept (a constant) for the relationships between X and Y

 $\beta_1$ : Regression coefficients of the variable that influence SOC contents in the relationships between X and Y.

€ is the noise or error associated with the SOC values

The model is called linear or simple regression because there is just one predictor variable in the model with linear  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta_1$  parameters.

Linear regression has the limitation that it handles one dependent variable at a time. A combination of variables cannot be factored into the model. Therefore, multiple regression analysis was undertaken to evaluate the contribution of combined variables.

#### Multiple regression analysis

The variables that showed significant Pearson's correlations with SOC contents were subjected to stepwise forward multiple regression analysis, using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) version 9.2 software.

| Predictor variable  | n  | R <sup>2</sup> | Regression equation  | Predicted SOC, (%) |      |  |
|---------------------|----|----------------|----------------------|--------------------|------|--|
|                     |    |                |                      | Min.               | Max. |  |
| Total Nitrogen (TN) | 85 | 0.79**         | Y = 0.005 + 14.22N   | 0.14               | 3.84 |  |
| CEC                 | 85 | 0.71**         | Y = - 0.57 + 0.19CEC | 0.04               | 3.12 |  |
| Са                  | 85 | 0.62**         | Y = 0.27 + 0.34Ca    | 0.21               | 3.46 |  |
| Zn                  | 85 | 0.58**         | Y = 0.28 + 1.49Zn    | 0.31               | 3.44 |  |
| Cu                  | 85 | 0.20**         | Y = 0.82 + 0.31Cu    | 0.83               | 2.61 |  |
| Clay                | 85 | 0.03**         | Y = 0.72 + 0.12Clay  | 0.84               | 1.57 |  |
| Fe                  | 85 | 0.22**         | Y = 0.65 + 0.006Fe   | 0.65               | 2.69 |  |
| Observed SOC (%)    | 85 | -              | -                    | 0.1                | 4.4  |  |

 Table 3. Results of prediction of SOC by linear regression analysis.

\*\* Predictor variable is significant at the 0.01 level.

The SOC (%) data from eighty five soil samples, representing the natural horizons from the thirty mini-pits (up to 60 cm depth) were factored into the model for analysis. Multiple linear regressions using the stepwise method (Blanchet *et al.*, 2008; Attua, 2009; Spiota and Sharma, 2013) were used to describe the effects of various independent variables on SOC contents as the dependent variable. The model employed was as described hereunder:

 $Y_n = a + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + \dots + b_n X_n + \in$ 

where:  $Y_n$  = Predicted SOC content of a soil, % (dependent variable).

 $X_1$ ,  $X_2$ ,  $X_n$  = Variables which influence SOC contents (independent variables), i.e. sand content, % slope, total nitrogen (TN), elevation, cation exchange capacity (CEC), and various chemical elements.

a = Intercept (a constant) for the relationships between X and Y

 $b_1$ ,  $b_2$ ,..... $b_n$  = Coefficients of the variables that influence SOC contents in the relationships between X and Y.

€ is the noise or error associated with the SOC values.

The goodness of fit of the model was based on  $R^2$  and probability levels.

The step-wise regression analysis was used to select significant variables, by either accepting or eliminating the respective predictor variables, based on the probability level (P-value). A predictor variable associated with a P-value less than the predetermined significance level was added; otherwise the variable was dropped. Data on SOC were first log-transformed in order to improve the normality of variables before they were factored into the model for analysis (Roberts, 2008). The model results are expected to contribute a guiding support tool for predicting SOC storage in different soil types in the Miombo woodlands with similar agroecological conditions.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

# Pearson's Correlations between SOC contents and possible predictor variables

The results of the Pearson's correlation matrix (Table 2) showed high (P< 0.01) positive correlation between SOC and total nitrogen (N), calcium (Ca), cation exchange capacity (CEC), zinc (Zn), iron (Fe), magnesium (Mg) and copper (Cu). In addition, relatively low positive correlation (P< 0.01) was indicated between SOC contents and potassium (K), manganese (Mn), phosphorus (P), silt and clay, whereas low negative correlation was indicated between SOC and sand (P< 0.01). The positive correlations imply that as the master variable of soil fertility, SOC correlates with most soil nutrients because soil organic matter (humus) adsorbs these nutrients. Metallic nutrients carry positive charges, thus are attracted to the negative charges (dissociated functional groups) of soil organic matter (Lu et al., 2012; Ferreiro et al., 2014). The positive correlation with P is due to the fact that P can be specifically adsorbed by soil colloids, including humus (Guppy et al., 2005; Criquet et al., 2007).

Specific adsorption is defined as the process in which atoms, ions or molecules of a substance collect on the surface of another substance, such as a solid, without entering into the solid's minute spaces as in absorption. Those ions adsorbed below the point of zero charge are concentrated at the interface, without the participation of electrostatic forces, and are therefore considered to be specifically adsorbed (Wisniewska *et al.*, 2014). Phosphate is one of the ions that can be specifically adsorbed, hence the positive correlation between Bray-1 P and SOC (Table 2). Similar relationships, between SOC contents and some of those variables above, have also been established by others (Attua, 2009; Fu *et al.*, 2010; Tian *et al.*, 2010; Jiménez *et al.*, 2011; Chang *et al.*, 2012; Vågen and Winowieck, 2012; Laurent *et al.*, 2014).

# Predictor variables of SOC contents using linear regression analysis

The results of regression analysis for predicting SOC contents are presented in Table 3. Out of 15 predictor variables factored into the linear regression model, seven variables predicted SOC to varying degrees ( $R^2$  values). These seven variables, which were significant (P<0.01) in predicting the SOC contents, were TN, Ca, CEC, Zn, Cu, clay and Fe. Total N had the largest contribution ( $R^2$  = 0.79\*\*) in predicting SOC. This was followed by CEC (R<sup>2</sup> =  $0.71^{**}$ ) and Ca (R<sup>2</sup> =  $0.62^{**}$ ), with smaller contributions by each of the other metallic elements. The comparison between the observed SOC (%) (Shelukindo et al., 2014) and the predicted SOC (Table 3) showed that TN had the closest values between observed and predicted SOC. The predicted values ranged from 0.14% (Profile No. 7. Cambisol) to 3.84% (Profile No. 1, Cambisol). The observed values ranged from 0.1% (Profile No. 7, Cambisol) to 4.4% (Profile No. 6, Fluvisol). Despite the relatively smaller R<sup>2</sup> value of 0.62\*\* for the Ca compared to that of CEC ( $R^2 = 0.71^{**}$ ), Ca predicted the SOC contents slightly better than CEC, probably due to its stronger binding ability with the negatively charged functional groups of organic matter (Gallon et al., 2010; Cotrufo et al., 2013), with the predicted values for Ca being in the range of 0.21 to 3.45% (Table 3). The extent to which prediction could be affected by combining the variables cannot be determined by simple linear regression. This was determined by multiple regression, as discussed in the following section below.

# Predicting SOC contents using multiple regression analysis

From the results of the step-wise regression analysis, twelve equations for predicting the SOC in KFR were established as shown in Table 4. In the first equation, TN highly significantly (P<0.01) contributed 97% of the prediction of SOC contents, much more than was predicted by TN in linear regression. Inclusion of Ca in the model increased the prediction (P<0.01) of SOC contents from 97% to 99%. The combination of all seven variables (TN, Ca, CEC, Zn, Cu, Clay and Fe) predicted the SOC stocks (P<0.01) by 99.93%. Although the additional individual contributions of Ca, CEC, Zn, Cu, clay or Fe in the step-wise predictions of SOC contents were minimal (Table 3), their combination improved the accuracy in predicting SOC over TN alone by an additional 3.3%. These results show that TN was the strongest predictor of SOC contents, followed by TN + Ca, with smaller contributions made by each of the other variables.

### Total N as the first predictor of SOC contents

Multiple regression analysis showed that the prediction of SOC contents was influenced highly (P< 0.001,  $R^2$  = 0.97) by nitrogen. This largest contribution of TN in predicting SOC contents may be explained by the fact that in the soil, N is one among the important integral components which form the complex structure of soil humic substances such as fulvic humic acids (Stevenson 1994; Kleber and Johnson, 2010; Schmidtet al., 2011; Guimaraes et al., 2013). There can be no increase in soil organic carbon without first a proportionate increase in nitrogen (Chang et al., 2012; Laurent et al., 2014). This implies that there is a constant and close relationship between the nitrogen and organic carbon in soils. It is concluded that neither carbon and, hence, soil organic matter, nor nitrogen, can be appreciably increased or decreased without a corresponding change in the other, hence the profound contribution of N in predicting SOC. Thus, proper management of soil nitrogen eventually leads to increase in the SOC contents and stocks, which, if realized globally, will play a vital role in global climate change regulation.

The results of the present study are consistent with findings of other researchers. A study conducted by Attua (2009) in Nigeria found that TN, CEC and leaf area together predicted 95% of the SOC. The study by Fu et al. (2010) in China reported that TN and SOC increased uniformly along a hill slope when there was no soil erosion. Sakin (2012), in the southeast Anatolia region, Turkey, reported a very high relationship between SOC and N ( $R^2 = 0.99$ , P< 0.01). Cao et al. (2012) in China reported the transformed-log SOC of the 0-10 cm and 10-20 cm soil layers to be well predicted by total N, with R<sup>2</sup>= 0.86 (P= 0.006) and R<sup>2</sup>= 0.82 (P= 0.007), respectively. Thus, land management strategies aiming at enhancing TN will also improve the SOC contents, and this may have implications in global climate change regulation if undertaken or realized on a large scale.

# Calcium as the additional (together with TN) predictor of SOC contents

The results (Table 4) also showed that the combination of Ca with TN was also a significant (P< 0.001,  $R^2 = 0.99$ ) SOC predictor. Of all the divalent ions in the ecosystem, calcium is the one that is strongly bound by both inorganic and organic anions (Gallon *et al.*, 2010; Cotrufo *et al.*, 2013). The stronger binding ability of calcium with organic anions makes it more superior than other divalent ions in predicting SOC contents.

Chaudhari *et al.* (2012) in Haridwar, India, reported a significant (P= 0.01) positive correlation (correlation coef-

Table 4. Step-wise multiple regression equations for predicting soil organic carbon contents.

| Predictor variables                      | R <sup>2</sup> | Regression equations  |
|--|----------------|---|
| Total N                                  | 0.9662**       | Y = 0.11 + 11.7 TN  |
| Total N + Ca                             | 0.9902**       | Y = 0.17 + 17.95TN - 0.29Ca   |
| Total N + CEC                            | 0.9705**       | Y = - 0.23 + 10.47TN + 0.1CEC   |
| Total N +Zn                              | 0.9669**       | Y = 0.01 + 14.22TN + 0.01Zn   |
| Total N + Cu                             | 0.9678**       | Y = 0.005 + 14.22TN + 0.1Cu   |
| Total N + Clay                           | 0.9674**       | Y = 0.01 + 14.47TN + 0.0002Clay   |
| Total N + Fe                             | 0.9665**       | Y = 0. 0 + 14.22TN + 0.0001 Fe  |
| Total N + Ca + CEC                       | 0.9947**       | Y = - 0.04 +15.66TN - 0.32Ca + 0.05CEC  |
| Total N + Ca + CEC + Zn                  | 0.9956**       | Y = - 0.11+ 14.75TN - 0.21Ca + 0.05CEC - 0.21Zn                                 |
| Total N + Ca + CEC + Zn + Cu             | 0.9974**       | Y = - 0.09 + 12.55TN – 0.06Ca + 0.04CEC – 0.51Zn + 0.25Cu                       |
| Total N + Ca + CEC + Zn + Cu + Clay      | 0.9988**       | Y = -0.05 + 13.04TN – 0.15Ca + 0.06CEC – 0.55Zn + 0.38Cu – 0.01Clay             |
| Total N + Ca + CEC + Zn + Cu + Clay + Fe | 0.9993**       | Y = - 0.07 + 11.97TN - 0.17Ca + 0.07CEC - 0.56Zn + 0.37Cu - 0.01Clay + 0.0001Fe |

\*\* Predictor variable is significant at the 0.01 level.

ficient (r) = 0.70) between SOC and Ca. Sapek (2013) in Poland reported that Ca uptake by plants increased with increasing concentrations of dissolved organic carbon in soil solutions, implying that the extra Ca was that bound and subsequently released by the organic matter. Thus, Ca, in combination with N, has a strong contribution in predicting SOC contents/stocks.

#### Contribution of other variables in prediction SOC contents

The results (Table 4) indicated that apart from TN and Ca, other additional variables (CEC, Zn, Cu, Clay and Fe), together with TN and Ca, contributed to improvements in SOC prediction (P< 0.01,  $R^2 = 0.999$ ), although their incremental contributions were relatively small.

A study conducted in West Africa by Attua (2009), showing that 95% of the variability in SOC was explained by CEC, TN and leaf area (LA) has already mentioned (above). Similarly, Orgill *et al.* (2014) in Australia reported that the SOC was correlated with CEC and N, while Samarian *et al.* (2013) in Iran

showed that CEC, which was highly correlated with clay content and with soil organic matter, accounted by about 69% the SOC contents in soils.

The binding of positive metal cations such Fe (Fe<sup>3+</sup>), Cu (Cu<sup>2+</sup>) and Zn (Zn<sup>2+</sup>) to anions such as dissociated carboxyl (COO<sup>-</sup>) and hydroxyl (OH<sup>-</sup>) groups of humic substances has also been reported by other researchers (Rovira and Vallejo, 2007; Guimaraes *et al.*, 2013). Ibrahim *et al.* (2011) in Nigeria also reported a positive correlation between Cu and SOC and between Zn and SOC. This may account for the incremental contributions of these metals in predicting SOC.

Sakin (2012), in southeastern Turkey, reported a strong relationship between SOC and clay (P< 0.001,  $R^2$ =0.96). Plante *et al.* (2006) in Ohio and Saskatchewan found a statistically significant positive relationship ( $R^2$ =0.48, P<0.01) between clay and SOC, as was similarly reported by Arrouays *et al.* (2006) in France.

The novelty of the current study was the quantification of the contributions of the metallic elements and clay to the prediction of SOC, however small the incremental contributions were.

|  |    | Predicted SO | PC (%)  |
|--|----|--------------|---------|
|  |    | Minimum      | Maximum |
| Predictor variable                       | n  |              |         |
| Total N                                  | 85 | 0.13         | 3.78    |
| Total N + Ca                             | 85 | 0.06         | 4.27    |
| Total N + CEC                            | 85 | 0.17         | 3.65    |
| Total N +Zn                              | 85 | 0.16         | 3.15    |
| Total N + Cu                             | 85 | 0.15         | 3.45    |
| Total N + Clay                           | 85 | 0.16         | 3.20    |
| Total N + Fe                             | 85 | 0.14         | 3.13    |
| Total N + Ca + CEC                       | 85 | 0.09         | 2.98    |
| Total N + Ca + CEC + Zn                  | 85 | 0.06         | 3.04    |
| Total N + Ca + CEC + Zn + Cu             | 85 | 0.11         | 3.58    |
| Total N + Ca + CEC + Zn + Cu + Clay      | 85 | 0.05         | 3.80    |
| Total N + Ca + CEC + Zn + Cu + Clay + Fe | 85 | 0.13         | 4.63    |
| Observed SOC (%)                         | 85 | 0.1          | 4.4     |

Table 5. Predicted SOC (%) following step-wise multiple regression analysis.

# Predicted values of SOC from multiple regression analysis

Table 5 shows the predicted SOC (%) values using the step-wise multiple regression analysis. The observed SOC results showed that the minimum and maximum SOC (%) of the soils were 0.1 and 4.4, respectively. This was closely predicted by TN, with the minimum SOC value being 0.13% (Profile No.9, Cambisol) and the maximum being 3.78% (Profile No.6, Fluvisol). The prediction by TN + Ca ranged from 0.06% (Profile No.9, Cambisol) to the maximum value of 4.27% (Profile No.1, Cambisol).

The prediction by the combination of TN with all the other variables ranged from 0.13% SOC (Profile No.9, Cambisol) to 4.63% SOC (Profile No.1, Cambisol). However, the predicted SOC values by TN + CEC were 0.17% as the minimum (Profile No.8, Fluvisol) and 3.65% as the maximum (Profile No.1, Cambisol), which was relatively more out of range as compared to the observed values. Thus, TN in combination with Ca could be chosen as the more reliable predictor for SOC contents. The combination of all variables in the model had only a minimal improvement to the prediction of SOC contents as compared to the prediction by TN and Ca, , and could be omitted without affecting the strength of the predictions. Thus, the combination of TN and Ca would save time and financial resources for the requisite field work and laboratory analysis, but would also provide equally strong SOC predictions, as it has demonstrated a strong congruence between predicted and observed SOC values (Table 5).

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Conclusions

The results of this study indicated that the combination of TN and Ca was very strong in predicting SOC contents because it accounted by 99% the OC predictions. Inclusion of the other variables (CEC, Cu, Zn, Clay and Fe) in concert improved the SOC prediction by only 0.009%. Hence, TN and Ca could be taken as the major predictors of SOC in the KFR. Table 5 showed that the predicted SOC (%) by TN in concert with Ca is closer to the observed SOC (%) values than the SOC predicted by the combination of all the variables. Therefore, these other characteristics can be omitted without affecting the strength of the predictions. Moreover, their omission will lead to a saving in time and financial costs for the field and laboratory analysis. Thus, in predicting SOC in Miombo woodlands, valuation of TN and Ca in soils could provide optimal information with the implications of saving time and financial resources.

### Recommendations

- In-depth studies on the SOC storage in Miombo woodland soils should be undertaken to broaden our understanding of the dynamics of TN and Ca as quick and reliable predictors of SOC stocks.
- It is recommended that sustainable forest and land management strategies in the KFR Miombo

woodland areas should put more emphasis on practices that may lead to the conservation and/or improvement of TN and Ca, which are the main predictors of SOC in the soils.

It is recommended that the findings of this study be tested/demonstrated in other areas with similar soil types, ecological conditions and vegetation types so as to validate their wider application.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are thankful for the financial support provided to the senior author by the Climate Change Impacts Adaptation and Mitigation Measures (CCIAM) Project, Sokoine University of Agriculture, under the research title: Quantification and mapping of carbon stocks and plant diversity in different land cover types in Tanzania, which enabled the main author to undertake this study.

### REFERENCES

- Arrouays D, Saby N, Walter C, Lemercie B, Schvartz C (2006). Relationships between particle-size distribution and organic carbon in French arable topsoils. Soil Use and Management 22 (1): 48-51.
- Aticho A (2013). Evaluating organic carbon storage capacity of forest soil: Case study in Kafa Zone Bita District, Southwestern Ethiopia. Am. Eur. J. Agric. Environ. Sci. 13 (1): 95 – 100.
- Attua EM (2009), Using Multiple Linear Regression Techniques to Quantify Carbon Stocks of Fallow Vegetation in the Tropics. West African J. App. Ecol. 12: 1 – 7.
- Black GR, Hartge KH (1986). Bulk Density. In: Methods of Soil Analysis. (Edited by Klute A), Am. Soc. Agron. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Madison, Wisconsin. pp. 364 – 376.
- Blanchet FG, Legendre P, Borcard D, (2008). Forward selection of explanatory variables. Ecology 89:2623-2632.
- Bray RH, Kurtz LT (1945). Determination of total, organic and available forms of phosphorus in soils. Soil Sc. 59: 39 –45.
- Bremner JM, Mulvaney CS (1982). *Total Nitrogen*. In: *Methods of Soil Analysis*. (Edited by Page LA, Miller RH, Keeney DR), Am. Soc. Agron. Madison, Wisconsin. pp. 595 – 624.
- Bruun S, Ågren GI, Christensen BT, Jensen LS (2010). Measuring and modeling continuous quality distributions of soil organic matter. Biogeosciences **7**: 27 – 41.
- Bryman A, Cramer D (1997). Quantitative Data Analysis with SPSS for Windows. A Guide for Social Scientists, Publishers Routledge London. p. 304.

Cao LH, Liu HM, Zhao SW (2012). Relationship between

carbon and nitrogen in degraded alpine meadow soil. African J. Agric. Res. 7(27):3945-3951.

- Chang R, Fu B, Liu G, Wang S, Yao X (2012). The effects of afforestation on soil organic and inorganic carbon: A case study of the Loess Plateau of China. Catena 95:145-152.
- Chaudhari PR, Ahire DV, Ahire VD (2012). Correlation between Physico-chemical properties and available nutrients in sandy loam soils of Haridwar. J. Chem. Biol. Phys. Sci. 2 (3):1493-1500.
- Criquet S, Braud, A, Nèble S (2007). Short-term effects of sewage sludge application on phosphates activities and available P fractions in Mediterranean soils. Soil Biol. Bioch. 39:921-929.
- Cotrufo MF, Wallenstein WD., Boot CM, Denef K, Paul E (2013).The Microbial Efficiency-Matrix Stabilization (MEMS) framework integrates plant litter decomposition with soil organic matter stabilization: do labile plant inputs form stable soil organic matter? Glob. Change Biol. 19:988-995.
- Day PR (1965). Particle fractionation and particle size analysis. In: Methods of Soil Analysis, Physical and Mineralogical Methods. (Edited by Black CA, Evans D D, White JL, Ensminger LE, Clark FE), Am. Soc. Agron. Madison, Wisconsin. pp. 545 – 566.
- FAO (2009). State of world's forests. Adaptation to climate change in agriculture forests and fisheries: Perspectives, framework priorities. Rome. [flp://flp.fa o.org/docrep/ fao/009/j9271e/j927le.pdf] site visited on 18/7/2013.
- Ferreiro JP, Lu H, Fu1 S, Méndez A, Gascó G.G (2014). Use of phytoremediation and biochar to remediate heavy metal polluted soils: a review. Solid Earth 5:65-75.
- Fu X, Shao M, Wei X, Horton R (2010). Soil organic carbon and total nitrogen as affected by vegetation types in Northern Loess Plateau of China. Geoderma 155 (1-2): 31-35.
- Galon Y, Finkler A, Fromm H (2010). Calcium-Regulated Transcription in Plants. Molecular Plant 3(4):653-669.
- Guimaraes DV, Gonzaga MIS, Silva, TO, Silva TL, Dias NS, Matias MIS (2013). Soil organic matter pools and carbon fractions in soil under different land uses. Soil Till. Res.126: 177-182.
- Guppy CN, Menzies NW, Moody PW, Blamey FPC (2005). Competitive sorption reactions between phosphorus and organic matter in soil: a review. Austr. J. Soil Res. 43:189-202.
- Hoffmann U, Hoffmann T, Johnson EA, Kuhn NJ (2014). Assessment of variability and uncertainty of soil organic carbon in a mountainous boreal forest (Canadian Rocky Mountains, Alberta). Catena 113:107-112.
- Ibrahim AK, Usman A, Abubakar B, Aminu UH (2011). Extractable micronutrients status in relation to other soil properties in Billiri Local Government Area. Gombe state. J. Soil Sci. Environ. Manag. 3(10): 282-285.
- Jandl R, Rodeghiero M, Martinez C, Cotrufo MF, Bampa F,

Wesemael BV, Harrison RB, Guerrini IA, Richter DD, Rustad L, Lorenz K, Chabbi A, Miglietta F (2014). Current status, uncertainty and future needs in soil organic carbon monitoring. Sci. Total Environ. 468: 376 – 383.

- Jha P, Biswas AK, Lakaria BL, Saha R, Singh M, Rao AS (2014). Predicting Total Organic Carbon Content of Soils from Walkley and Black Analysis. *Communications in Soil Sci. Plant Analysis* [doi: 10.1080/00103624.2013. 874023] site 10/3/2014.
- Jiménez JJ, Lorenz K, Lal R (2011). Organic carbon and nitrogen in soil particle-size aggregates under dry tropical forests from Guanacaste, Costa Rica. Implications for within-site soil organic carbon stabilization. Catena 86: 178-191.
- Kinnear PR, Gray CD (1999). *SPSS for Windows Made Simple*, Third edition. Psychology Press Ltd, Hove, United Kingdom. 13pp.
- Kleber M, Johnson MG (2010). Advances in understanding the molecular structure of soil organic matter: Implications for interactions in the environment. Adva. Agron. 106: 77-142.
- Lal, R. (2005). Forest Soils and Carbon Sequestration. For. Ecol. Manag. 220: 242–258
- Lal R 2009. Sequestering carbon in soils of arid ecosystems. Land Degrad. Development 20: 441 454.
- Laurent DS, Gervais VB, Berthelot JS (2014). Comparison of soil organic carbon and total nitrogen contents in inundated and non-inundated zones in Southern Québec, Canada. Catena 113:1-8.
- Lindsay WL, Norvell WA (1978). Development of DTPA soil test for Zn, Fe, Mn and Cu. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 42: 421 428.
- Lu H, Zhang YY, Huang X, Wang S, Qiu R (2012). Relative distribution of Pb<sup>2</sup>+ sorption mechanisms by sludge-derived biochar. Water Res. 46:854-862.
- Meersmans J, De Rider F, Canters F, De Beats S, Van Mole M (2008), A Multiple Regression Approach to Assess the Spatial Distribution of Soil Organic Carbon (SOC) at the Regional Scale (Flanders, Belgium). Gendarme 143 (1 - 2): 1 - 13
- Negi SS, Gupta MK, Sharma SD (2013). Sequestered organic carbon pool in the forest soils of Uttarakhand State, India. Int. J. Sci. Environ. Tech. 2(3): 510 520.
- Nelson DW, Sommers LE (1982). Total Carbon, Organic Carbon and Organic Matter. In: Methods of Soil Analysis. Chemical and Microbiological Properties (Edited by Page AL), Am. Soc. Agron. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Madison, Wisconsin. pp. 539 – 579.
- Nocita M, Stevens A, Toth G, Panagos P, Wesemael BV, Montanarella L (2014). Prediction of soil organic carbon content by diffuse reflectance spectroscopy using a local partial least square regression approach. Soil Biol. Bioch. 68: 337-347.
- Nshubemuki L, Mbwambo L (2007). Trees to Promote in the Management of Miombo Woodlands in Tanzania:

Species, Sizes and Qualities. In: (Editors by Varmola, M., Valkonen, S. and Tapaninen, S.), *Proceedings of the First MITMIOMBO Project Workshop Management of Indigenous Tree Species for Ecosystem Restoration and Wood Production in Semi-Arid Miombo Woodlands in Eastern Africa,* held in Morogoro, Tanzania, 6–12 February 2007. pp. 57–63.

- Orgill SE, Condon JR, Conyers MK, Greene RSB, Morris SG, Murphy BW (2014). Sensitivity of soil carbon to management and environmental factors within Australianperennial pasture systems. Geoderma 214–215 :70–79.
- Plante AF, Conant RT, Stewart CE, Paustian K, Six J (2006). Impact of soil texture on the distribution of soil organic matter in physical and chemical fractions. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. **7**0 (1): 287–296.
- Roberts S (2008). Transform your data. Statistics Column. *Nutrition* 24: 492- 494.
- Rovira P, Vallejo VR (2007). Labile, recalcitrant and inert organic matter in Mediterranean forest soils. Soil Biol. Bioch. 39: 202 – 215.
- Sakin E (2012). Relationships between carbon, nitrogen stocks and texture of the Harran plain soils in Southeastern Turkey. Bulgarian J. Agric. Sci. 18 (4): 626-634.
- Samarian F, Anima S, Keshavarzi A, Ahmadi A (2013). Neural computing model for prediction of Soil Cation Exchange Capacity: A Data Mining Approach. Intern. J. Agron. Plant Prod. 4 (7): 1706-1712.
- Sapek B (2013). Relationship between dissolved organic carbon and calcium and magnesium in soil water phase and their uptake by meadow vegetation. *J.* Water and Land Development. 19: 69-76.
- Schmidt MWI, Torn MS, Abive S, Dittimar T, Guggenberger G, Janssens IA, Kleber M, Kogel-Knabner I, Lehmann J, Manning DAC, Nannipieri P, Rasse DP, Weiner S, Trumbore SE (2011). Persistence of soil organic matter as an ecosystem property. Nature 478: 49 – 56.
- Shelukindo HB, Msanya BM, Semu E, Mwango S, Singh BR, Munishi PKT (2014). Characterization of Some Typical Soils of the Miombo Woodland Ecosystem of Kitonga Forest Reserve, Iringa, Tanzania: Physicochemical Properties and Classification. J. Agric. Sci. Tech. *A.* 4 (3): 224–234.
- Spiotta EM, Sharma S (2013).Carbon storage in successional and plantation forest soils: A tropical analysis. Glob. Ecol. Biogeography 22:105-117.
- Stevenson FJ (1994). Humus chemistry: Genesis, composition, reactions. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York. p. 496.
- Stockmann U, Adams MA, Crawford JW, Field DJ, Henakaarchchi N, Jenkins M, Minasny B, McBratney AB, Courcelles VR, Singh K, Wheeler I, Abbott L, Angers DA, Baldock J, Bird M, Brookes PC, Chenu C, Jastrow JD, Lal R, Lehmann JO', Donnell AG, Parton WJ, Whitehead D, Zimmermann M (2013). The knowns,

known unknowns and unknowns of sequestration of soil organic carbon. Agric. Ecosystem. Environ. 164: 80 – 99.

- Thomas GW (1982). Exchangeable Cations. In: Methods of Soil Analysis, Chemical and Mineralogical Properties. (Edited by Page LA, Miller RH, Keeny DR), Am. Soc. Agron. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Madison, Wisconsin. pp. 595 – 624.
- Tian H, Chen G, Zhang C, Melillo JM, Hall CAS (2010). Pattern and variation of C:N:P ratios in China's soils: A synthesis of observational data. Biogeochemistry 98:139–151.
- Vågen TG, Winowieck LA (2012). Mapping of soil organic carbon stocks for spatially explicit assessments of climate change mitigation potential. Environ. Res. Let. 8: 9 – 10.
- Watanabe FS, Olsen SR (1965). Test of an ascorbic acid method for determining phosphorus in water and NaHCO<sub>3</sub> extracts from soil. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc. 29: 677 678.
- Wisniewska M, Urban T, Grzadka E, Zarko V, Gun'ko VM (2014). Comparison of adsorption affinity of polyacrylic acid for surfaces of mixed silica- alumina. Colloidal and polymer Sci. 292:699-705.
- Woollen E, Casey RM, Mathew W (2012). Carbon stocks in an African woodland landscape: Spatial distribution and scales of variation. J. Ecosystems 15: 804 – 818.
- Yuan Z, Antonio G, Fei L, Ji Y, Shuai S, Xugao W, Miao W, Zhanqing H (2013). Soil organic carbon in an oldgrowth temperate forest: Spatial pattern, determinants and bias in its quantification. Geoderma 195 (196): 48 – 55.