Evaluation of the ecological niche of some abundant species of the subfamily Platyninae (Coleoptera, Carabidae) against the background of eight ecological factors
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Abstract

Based on the results of 15 years of research in five regions in the steppe zone of Ukraine we have analysed the relationship between species of the subfamily Platyninae and the eight most significant ecological factors for litter macrofauna in forest ecosystems. In the forests of Ukraine Calathus ambiguus (Paykull, 1790) is a typical mesophile, with a slight preference for pine forests. C. erratus (C.R. Sahlberg, 1827) is at its most numerous in xeromesophilous moisture conditions with an average abundance of ants. C. fuscipes (Goeze, 1777) favours broad-leaved forests with 40–80% tree crown density, a sparse herbaceous layer, and clay soil with high salinity. C. melanocephalus (Linnaeus, 1758) is at its most numerous in forests with a deep litter layer with average soil salinity. Dolichus halensis (Schaller, 1783) is often found in forests with of low crown density and favours areas with high salinity. Anchomenus dorsalis (Pontoppidan, 1763) favours plots with scattered trees, thick grass, mesophilous moisture conditions and low abundance of ants. Limodromus krynickii (Sperk, 1835) inhabits forests with a thin litter layer, hygrophilous moisture conditions and soils with low salinity. Oxypselaphus obscurus (Herbst, 1784) inhabits moist areas of forests with acid, sandy soil. The methods used in this research allow a quantitative multiple level assessment of the ecological niches of different species of litter invertebrate to be made.
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Introduction
The requirements of a species of litter invertebrate regarding level of humidity, light, soil salinity and soil texture are among the basic parameters which determine whether it is present or absent in a given ecosystem (Thiele, 1977). The presence of a species at a particular site means that its environmental requirements are met, that a potential ecological niche is filled (Hutchinson, 1957).

The borders between potential ecological niches are harder to research than those between niches which are occupied. The data for laboratory research on the influence of tolerance of species, for example, for a light or temperature regime cannot always be extrapolated for natural habitats (Thiele, 1977). Assessment of potential ecological niches in natural ecosystems of a particular climatic zone can only be made by analyzing the abundance of a given invertebrate species across dozens or hundreds of sites (Brygadyrenko, 2004, 2006). Up to now, research of this kind has not been conducted for ground beetles.

In the steppe zone of Ukraine over 80% of the territory is given over to agriculture, with forest habitats occupying no more than 10% of the territory (Belgard, 1971). Forests in this zone are characterized by the extreme phytogenic variety of both natural and cultivated species, with the number of dominant tree species amounting to over 30 (Brygadyrenko, 2015). Forest ecosystems in the south of Ukraine are subject to the contrasting, often hostile, conditions of their surrounding environment, and in many cases have a strongly steppe phytocenosis. For
this reason, a detailed study of the distribution of particular ground beetle species in these habitats is a convenient method of conducting research at the maximum level of detail into their potential ecological niches.

In Europe the subfamily Platyninae Bonelli, 1810 (www.faunaear.org) is represented by the tribes Omphreini, Platynini and Sphodrini. The first of these includes a single genus Omphreus, the second by 13 genera (Agelaec, Agonom, Anchomenus, Atranus, Cardiomeria, Galacodytes, Limodromus, Oiithopus, Olyxpholus, Paranchus, Platynus, Pseudanchomenus and Sericoda), the third by 19 genera (Amaroschema, Gomerina, Paraeutrichopus, Platytcerus, Pseudomyas, Pseudoplatyderus, Calathus, Synuchidius, Anchomenidius, Dolichus, Cadathidius, Hystricosphodrus, Laemostenus, Lictinopsis, Pseudotaphoxenus, Sphodropsis, Sphodrus, Taphoxenus and Synuchus). Only 38 species of Platynini and 20 species of Sphodrini inhabit Ukraine, and the variety of species of these subfamilies is much lower in the steppe zone than in the forest-steppe and forest zones (Brygadyrenko, 2003a; Putschkov, 2011, 2012).

Species belonging to the ground beetle subfamily Platyninae differ sharply in their ecological preferences, especially with regard to habitat type, moisture, character of the soil, and peculiarities of the plant cover (Hůrka, 1996; Brygadyrenko, 2003a). Some species favour xerophilous ecosystems, though most inhabit mesophilous and hygrophilous habitat types (Lindroth, 1985). The variety of their habitat requirements, the wide distribution and high abundance of many of these species make the subfamily Platyninae a convenient object for study of ecological niches.

The aim of this research is thus the assessment of the potential ecological niches of 8 species of ground beetle of the Platyninae subfamily, dominant in forests in the steppe zone of Ukraine, measured against the background of 8 ecological factors.

Material and methods

The counting of the ground beetles was conducted in five regions (Dnepropetrovsk, Zaporzhie, Nikolayev, Donetsk and Kharkov) of Ukraine from 2001 to 2014 in natural and planted forests of various types and ages. In this report ground beetles from 836 forest sites are analysed. The same methodology was applied at each site: the soil and vegetational conditions were evaluated and the ground beetles were collected in soil traps; a standard geobotanical description was made (the crown density of the tree layer and the density of the herbaceous layer were measured both as a combined total and also for every plant species separately); the litter depth was measured (taken as the average of ten measurements); the soil texture was noted (clay, loam, sandy loam, sand); the soil humidity was assessed (using indicator species of the herbaceous layer, according to the scale devised for the steppe zone by Belgard (1950)); the soil texture was assessed (using indicator species of the herbaceous layer, according to Belgard’s (1950) scale); the abundance of ants was determined (using soil traps). A detailed description of the forest ecosystems of the steppe zone of Ukraine, giving details for different plant species, can be found in Belgard’s (1950, 1971) works on forestry in this zone. A more detailed geobotanical description of the research plots can be found in our earlier publications (Brygadyrenko, 2005, 2014, 2015; Brygadyrenko and Solov’ev, 2007).

The count of ground beetles in the litter was conducted using standard methods: at each site 10 half litre soil traps (with 20% NaCl solution) were placed at least two metres from each other. The traps were checked on average every 5th day (depending on the weather conditions), and, overall, 3–24 collections were made for every sample plot. The abundance of each ground beetle species was calculated from specimens collected per 10 trap-days, subjected to standard ANOVA methods in the package Statistica 8.0. The diagrams (Figs 1–8) show the average number of each species (specimens/10 trap-days), vertical bars denote 95% confidence intervals. Above every graph is shown the factual value of the Fisher criterion for a specified degree of freedom, and also the reliability of differences between different abundance values for the ground beetles. Differences in the abundance of species were considered significant at p < 0.05. We considered that insignificant differences at 0.05 < p < 0.10 represented only a tendency.

Results

Calathus ambiguus (Paykull, 1790), as a eurybiont species, tends to be at its most abundant in xeromesophilous and mesophilous conditions (Fig. 1e), with average abundance of ants (Fig. 1b) and in pine forests (Fig. 1b). Its frequency is 3.7%, average abundance – 0.014 ± 0.101 specimens/10 trap-days and 0.276% of the total number of carabid beetles collected in forests of the steppe zone of Ukraine.

The abundance of Calathus erratus (C.R. Sahlberg, 1827) is significantly greater in xeromesophilous moisture conditions (Fig. 2e), with an average abundance of ants (Fig. 2h). In comparison with C. ambiguus (Fig. 1) this species is more xerophilous and favours plots with lower numbers of ants. Its frequency is 3.0%, average abundance – 0.009 ± 0.068 specimens/10 trap-days and 0.169% of the total number of carabid beetles collected in forests of the steppe zone of Ukraine.

Calathus fuscipes (Goeze, 1777) is a steppe species, frequently found on fields, in anthropogenically transformed ecosystems, where it is numerically dominant in the litter macrofauna. Against the background of 6 of the 8 analysed ecological factors the abundance of C. fuscipes varies significantly. It reaches its maximum abundance at
sites where tree crown density is 40–80% (Fig. 3a), in broad-leaved forests (Fig. 3b), herbaceous cover density 20–40% (Fig. 3c), the litter layer is 10–40 mm (Fig. 3d), with clay soil (Fig. 3e), in the trophotope Dn (Fig. 3g). A lower abundance was observed (on the level of a tendency) at sites where ants were abundant (over 64 specimens/10 trap-days, Fig. 3h). Its frequency was 11.7%, average abundance – 0.26 ± 1.62 specimens/10 trap-days and 4.95% of the total number of carabid beetles collected in forests of the steppe zone of Ukraine.

*Calathus melanocephalus* (Linnaeus, 1758) was significantly more abundant in forests of the steppe zone at sites with a thick litter layer (30–40 mm, Fig. 4d) and with soils of average salinity (Fig. 4g). Other factors analysed influence *C. melanocephalus* only at the level of tendency: abundance was greater in mesohydrophilous and hygrophilous moisture conditions (Fig. 4e) and sites with low numbers of ants (Fig. 4h). Its frequency was 3.8%, average abundance – 0.012 ± 0.083 specimens/10 trap-days and 0.237% of the total number of carabid beetles collected in forests of the steppe zone of Ukraine.

The abundance of *Dolichus halensis* (Schaller, 1783) was significantly higher at sites with a low tree crown density (Fig. 5a), in trophotope Dn (Fig. 5g). Its abundance was slightly higher (at the level of a tendency) at clay soil sites (Fig. 5f) and low numbers of ants (Fig. 5h). Its frequency was 6.0%, average abundance – 0.080 ± 0.594 specimens/10 trap-days and 1.53% of the total number of carabid beetles collected in forests of the steppe zone of Ukraine.

The abundance of *Anchomenus dorsalis* (Pontoppidan, 1763) was significantly greatest at forest sites with a low crown density (Fig. 6a), maximum level of herbaceous cover (Fig. 6c), mesophilous moisture conditions (Fig. 6e) and low abundance of ants (<16 specimens/10 trap-days, Fig. 6h). Its frequency was – 1.8%, average abundance – 0.056 ± 1.090 specimens/10 trap-days and 1.08% of the total number of carabid beetles collected in forests of the steppe zone of Ukraine.

*Limodromus krynickii* (Sperk, 1835) is a forest meadow species of ground beetle, which in forest ecosystems varies significantly in abundance in relation to 2 of...
Fig. 3. Influence of forest ecosystem conditions on Calathus fuscipes (Goeze, 1777).
For explanation see key to Fig. 1.

(a) $F(4, 833) = 3.91, p = 0.004$
(b) $F(2, 835) = 3.07, p = 0.047$
(c) $F(4, 833) = 9.78, p < 0.001$
(d) $F(4, 833) = 1.20, p = 0.307$
(e) $F(4, 833) = 6.13, p < 0.001$
(f) $F(3, 834) = 5.31, p = 0.001$
(g) $F(3, 834) = 6.20, p < 0.001$
(h) $F(3, 834) = 2.40, p = 0.048$

Fig. 2. Influence of forest ecosystem conditions on Calathus erratus (C.R. Sahlberg, 1827).
For explanation see key to Fig. 1.

(a) $F(4, 833) = 1.79, p = 0.128$
(b) $F(2, 835) = 0.54, p = 0.584$
(c) $F(4, 833) = 0.66, p = 0.618$
(d) $F(4, 833) = 0.97, p = 0.420$
(e) $F(4, 833) = 3.37, p = 0.009$
(f) $F(3, 834) = 0.48, p = 0.696$
(g) $F(3, 834) = 0.47, p = 0.701$
(h) $F(3, 834) = 0.47, p = 0.701$
Fig. 4. Influence of forest ecosystem conditions on *Calathus melanocephalus* (Linnaeus, 1758).
For explanation see key to Fig. 1.

Fig. 5. Influence of forest ecosystem conditions on *Dolichus halensis* (Schaller, 1783).
For explanation see key to Fig. 1.
Fig. 6. Influence of forest ecosystem conditions on Anchomenus dorsalis (Pontoppidan, 1763).
For explanation see key to Fig. 1.

Fig. 7. Influence of forest ecosystem conditions on Limodromus krynickii (Sperk, 1835).
For explanation see key to Fig. 1.
the 8 analysed ecological factors. Its abundance reaches its maximum in hygrophilous moisture conditions (Fig. 7e) and in trophotypes De, E (Fig. 7g). It was noted that it tended to be more numerous at sites with a low abundance of ants (Fig. 7h), on plots with a thin litter layer (10–20 mm, Fig. 7d). Its frequency was 1.9%, average abundance – 0.012 ± 0.140 specimens/10 trap-days and 0.237% of the total number of carabid beetles collected in forests of the steppe zone of Ukraine.

**Oxypselaphus obscurus** (Herbst, 1784) is a hygrophilous forest meadow species of ground beetle, which in the steppe zone significantly varies in abundance in relation to 3 of the 8 ecological factors analysed. Its abundance reaches its maximum in hygrophilous moisture conditions (Fig. 8e), on sandy soils (Fig. 8f), in trophotypes AB, B and C (Fig. 8g). Abundance of ants (Fig. 8h), tree crown density (Fig. 8a) or density of herbaceous cover (Fig. 8c) did not significantly influence the abundance of *O. obscurus*. Its frequency was 1.9%, average abundance – 0.012 ± 0.140 specimens/10 trap-days and 0.237% of the total number of carabid beetles collected in forests of the steppe zone of Ukraine.

According to the results of our research, the abundance of only one of the species studied, *C. ambiguus*, was not significantly influenced by any of the factors (Table 1). The abundance of *C. erratus* was influenced by only one factor, *C. melanocephalus*, *L. krynickii* and *D. halensis* significantly varied in relation to two factors, *A. dorsalis* and *O. obscurus* in relation to three factors. The abundance of *C. fuscipes* varied significantly in response to six factors.

Soil salinity influences significantly 5 of the 8 selected ground beetle species belonging to the Platyninae subfamily. Soil moisture and tree crown density influence 3 species. Litter depth, density of herbaceous cover and soil texture influence 2 species. Type of forest ecosystem and abundance of ants influence 1 species (Table 1).

The results of our cluster analysis for the distribution of the species studied on the sample plots show the greatest degree of similarity in the patterns for *C. melanocephalus*, *C. erratus* and *C. ambiguus* (Fig. 9). The lowest degree of similarity in distribution of these species was shown for *O. obscurus*, *L. krynickii* and *D. halensis*. The xerophilous *A. dorsalis* and *C. fuscipes* present a second species cluster showing a low level of distributional similarity.

**Discussion**

**Phylogenetic similarity and ecological adaptability of species in the genus Calathus**

The genus *Calathus* consists of 177 species classified into 10 subgenera (GAÑÁN et al., 2008). RUIZ et al. (2012) state that the genera *Calathus* and *Dolichus* split at the boundary of the Eocene and Oligocene (about 34 million
years ago). Following this, one of the youngest groups of the *Calathus* genus appeared, the group of species related to *C. fuscipes*, with the greatest intensity of species development occurring in the mountain ranges of Southern Europe during periods of glaciations, when small populations remained in the southern Pyrenees, the Apennines and the Balkan Peninsula (Ruiz et al., 2009, 2010, 2012).

In Central Europe the number of species belonging to the genus *Calathus* is not high, and is dominated by species with a wide range and a fairly high level of ecological adaptability (Vereschagina, 1984).

Study of the biological variety of *Calathus* ground beetles has been conducted most fully in Spain: both from the perspective of territorial distribution in particular areas and that of occupation of ecological niches by particular species (Gañán et al., 2008). Negre (1969) was the first to make a detailed analysis of the distribution of *Calathus* species on the Iberian Peninsula, recording 13 species of this genus (the greatest number of species being in the foothills and the mountains of the Pyrenees). In the Iberian Peninsula, there are now known to be 23 species present, 14 (70%) of which are endemic to the peninsula (Gañán et al., 2008). According to Serrano (2013) 27 taxa at the level of species and subspecies inhabit Spain. Analysis of the distribution of *Calathus* species on seven of the Canary Islands (colonization and diversification) using Polymerase Chain Reaction Amplification and Sequencing allowed Emerson et al. (2000) to identify the routes and timing of the colonisation of these islands from continental Europe.

It is well known that various species of this genus are well able to thrive in agricultural landscapes (Kromp, 1999; Lang et al., 1999; Magura, 2002; Kutasi et al., 2004). *C. fuscipes*, *C. erratus* and *C. melanocephalus* (Schwerk and Szyszko, 2012) form the dominant ground beetle fauna on abandoned agricultural land in Poland. Błaszkiewicz and Schwerk (2013), in their research in west Poland (Wałecki district), an area composed of various forests, agricultural and post-agricultural areas at different stages of succession, found that *C. erratus* composed 3.3%, *C. fuscipes* – 3.9%, *C. melanocephalus* – 1.5% of the Carabid population. Ground beetles of
the genus *Calathus* are one of the faunal components of agroecosystems and are fairly common in eastern Latvia: *C. fuscipes* – 0.26%, *C. erratus* – 0.45%, *C. ambiguus* – 0.44%, *C. melanoleucus* – 0.13% of the Carabid population (Bukejs and Balalaikins, 2008). However, despite sharing an ability to survive in the extreme conditions of agricultural activity, *Calathus* species differ in their range and ecological niches.

**C. ambiguus**

A West Palaearctic species, ranging to West Siberia and Central Asia (Hůrka, 1996). In the former Soviet Union *C. ambiguus* is distributed across the whole of its European territory, eastwards to the Altai, the southern limit of its range being in to Iran and Afghanistan (Vereschagina, 1984; Kryzhanovskij et al., 1995). Putchkov (2012) mentions that it occurs throughout the territory of Ukraine.

Vereschagina (1984) states that *C. ambiguus* favours open, dry steppe habitat. According to Lindroth (1985), in Fennoscandia *C. ambiguus* is a “rather stenotopic species, living in open, dry country on sandy or gravelly, sometimes clay-mixed soil with sparse vegetation, notably on southern slopes. Also in agricultural land on sandy fields. The species is often found together with *C. erratus*. Lindroth (1974) states that in Great Britain *C. ambiguus* shares the same habitat preference as *C. erratus*, with which it is often associated; also occurring in chalk pits. In the Czech and Slovak Republic *C. ambiguus* is “common in dry and warm unshaded habitats: fields, steppe; lowlands to hills” (Hůrka, 1996). In Spain *C. ambiguus* is common, occurring in 11 of the 23 regions Serrano (2013), while it is also included in the fauna of Turkey (Kesdek and Yildirim, 2004).

Sigida (1993) considers *C. ambiguus* to be a polytopic mesophile, typical of natural steppe areas and pastureland, bairaks (ravine forest) and floodplain forest, salines and areas of high salinity, semi-desert areas, agricultural and urban landscapes. In Moldova *C. ambiguus* is a mesoxerophilic steppe species, not often found in cultivated fields, vinyards and gardens (Karpov and Matalin, 1993). In the Non-Chernozem Area of Russia small numbers of specimens of *C. ambiguus* have been collected from fields sewn with winter wheat and maize (Soboleva-Dokuchaeva, 1995).

**C. erratus**

A Eurosiberian species (Hůrka, 1996). In the former USSR *C. erratus* extends as far as the Primorski Kray, ranging in the north beyond the Arctic Circle (Vereschagina, 1984; Kryzhanovskij et al., 1995). Putchkov (2012) states that it occurs throughout Ukraine.

Lindroth (1985) states that in Fennoscandia *C. erratus* is “xerophilous, usually occurring on dry, sandy or gravelly soil poor in humus and with sparse vegetation. Predominantly in open country, for instance on *Calluna*-heath, in dunes, and in dry meadows and grassland; also in thin forests. It is frequently encountered on agricultural land on light soil, notably in root crop fields”. Lindroth (1974) mentions that in Great Britain *C. erratus* occurs on dry, usually sandy ground with sparse vegetation. The northern population of *C. erratus* in Fennoscandia is macropterous, on the shores of the Baltic brachypterous specimens predominate (Lindroth, 1979). In the Non-Chernozem Area of Russia *C. erratus* inhabits forest ecosystems (Soboleva-Dokuchaeva, 1995). In the south of the Baikal region *C. erratus* inhabits mesophilous and steppe type meadows, forest clearings, slopes of ravines, fallow and wasteland (Shilenkov, 1978). In the Czech Republic and Slovakia *C. erratus* is “common in dry, unshaded habitats: fields, forests, *Calluna*-heath; lowlands to mountains, frequent in hills” (Hůrka, 1996).

It is rarer in the southern part of its range, being mainly associated with forest ecosystems. Sigida (1993) considers *C. erratus* to be a polytopic mesophile, typical of natural steppe areas and pastures, bairak and floodplain forests. *C. erratus* occurs in only one of the 23 regions of Spain researched by Serrano (2013). It has not been recorded in Moldova (Karpova and Matalin, 1993).

**C. fuscipes**

A West Palaearctic species, introduced in North America (Hůrka, 1996). Common across the entire European part of the former USSR, the southern limit of its range is in North Africa and Iran (Vereschagina, 1984; Kryzhanovskij et al., 1995). In Ukraine *C. fuscipes graecus* (Dejean, 1831), (Putchkov, 2012) occurs in the southern subzone of the steppe zone (right bank of the Dnieper, westwards) and in the Crimean peninsula. *C. fuscipes fuscipes* (Goeze, 1777) occurs throughout the rest of Ukraine.

In Fennoscandia according to Lindroth (1985) *C. fuscipes* is a “eurytopic species, predominantly occurring in open country on rather dry, notably sandy or clay soil more or less rich in humus, e.g. in meadows and grassland; often on cultivated soil and also in light forests”.

Lindroth (1974) states that in Great Britain *C. fuscipes* occurs “in moderately dry meadows and grassland, often on cultivated soil; also in thin forests”. In the Czech and Slovak Republics *C. fuscipes* is “very common, in unshaded, rather dry habitats: meadows, fields, steppe; lowlands to mountains” (Hůrka, 1996). According to Serrano (2013) *C. fuscipes* occurs throughout almost all of Spain.

*C. fuscipes* Sigida (1993) is a forest mesophile, occurring in bairak and floodplain forests, agricultural and urban landscapes. In Moldova *C. fuscipes* is a mesophile, belonging to the meadow-field group, being uncommon only on sewn perennial grassland (Karpova and Matalin, 1993). According to Klausnitzer (1987) *C. fuscipes* is one of the most abundant species of ground beetle in
urban habitats, occurring in the sports stadiums, lawns and airports of Warsaw and Keln; the author considers the species to be a eurytopic mesophile of open ground, dominating on fields. According to Kocourek et al. (2013), in the Czech Republic C. fuscipes comprised 0.8% of the total of carabid beetles collected from maize fields at the Prague-Ruzyně site (Central Bohemia), and 11.1% of the total of carabid beetles collected at the same time at the Ivanovice na Hane site (Central Moravia). In Hungary, in a lowland oak forest-grassland complex (Tóthmérész et al., 2014) C. fuscipes proved to be one of the most reliable indicators of grassland as opposed to edge and forest ecosystems.

C. melanocephalus

A Palaearctic species, probably introduced in North America (Hurka, 1996). C. melanocephalus is common all over Europe in lowland habitats and alpine areas up to the middle alpine region (Lindroth, 1985). Vereschagina (1984) states that in the former USSR C. melanocephalus is one of the most abundant and eurybiont species. Putchkov (2012) mentions that it occurs throughout Ukraine. Serrano (2013) states that C. melanocephalus inhabits practically all regions of Spain.

According to Lindroth (1985), in Fennoscandia C. melanocephalus is a “commonly distributed species which usually lives in open country on different kinds of moderately dry ground with sparse vegetation, achieving its greatest abundance on sandy soil. It is a common inhabitant of dry meadows, grassland, dunes and heath; also on agricultural land and in thin forests, mainly of Pinus. It is frequent in the fields up to the lower alpine region.” The species is nocturnal and its reproductive period is mainly August–September in Scandinavia (Nylund, 1991). Lindroth (1974) states that in Great Britain C. melanocephalus occurs on all kinds of open moderately dry soil with grass, meadow or weed vegetation.

In the Czech Republic and Slovakia C. melanocephalus is “very common, mainly in unshaded or moderately shaded habitats: fields, steppe; lowlands to mountains” (Hurka, 1996). C. melanocephalus Sigida (1993) is a polytopic mesophile, typical of natural steppe areas and pastureland, barjak and floodplain forest, salines and areas of high salinity, and agricultural landscapes. In Moldova C. melanocephalus is a mesophile, belonging to the meadow-field group, common on fields in floodplains and dry interfluvies, rare in isolated forest blocks (Karpoza and Matalin, 1993). In the Non-Chernozem Area of Russia C. melanocephalus comprises on average 2.3% of the total number of ground beetles; on fields of winter wheat – 7.5%, in forest ecosystems – 4.9%, on sewn beetroot – 3.6%, clover – 2.4%, barley – 1.1% (Soboleva-Dukuchaeva, 1995).

The age structure of C. melanocephalus populations can vary in different ecosystems (Van Dijk, 1972). Some specimens can live longer than usual, which can lead to higher populations in particular ecosystems. The results of laboratory experiments of Van Dijk (1994) showed that the average number of eggs laid by a female C. melanocephalus increased from 50.9 to 73.8 and 142.5 eggs for one female when the beetle’s food consumption was increased from 1 to 2 and 5 mg/day respectively.

Various species in the genus move exclusively on the surface of the soil, for many, for example C. melanocephalus (Aukema, 1990), short wings are the dominant trait, while long wings are a recessive trait. The expression of genes for long wings could be modified by environmental factors such as temperature and food supply (Aukema, 1991). It is possible that prolonged summer migrations account for the presence of small numbers this species in unsuitable habitat.

D. halensis

A Palaearctic species, reaching the southern Kuril Islands, Japan and South China (Hurka, 1996). In the former USSR D. halensis does not extend as far north as the other species of Calathus discussed above; the range of D. halensis extends as far east as Primorski Kray (Vereschagina, 1984; Kryzhanovski et al., 1995). Putchkov (2012) states that it occurs throughout Ukraine. It is significantly less common in the south of its range: according to Serrano (2013) D. halensis was found only in 2 of Spain’s 23 regions, Keske and Yildirim (2004) consider D. halensis a rare species in Turkey.

The species is highly abundant in the Far East. At nine sites of three forest types selected in order to examine the effects of forest habitat in the Japanese red pine of Naju City, South Korea D. halensis comprised 17.4% of the total numbers of ground beetles trapped (Do and Joo, 2013). Do et al. (2014) in their study at Eulsukdo Island landfill (Republic of Korea) found that D. halensis comprised 30.8% of over 92,000 ground beetle specimens trapped. Despite these high figures, the abovementioned authors consider this flightless species which breeds in autumn to belong to the group which dominates in grassland and not forest ecosystems.

Research conducted in Busan Metropolitan City (Republic of Korea) showed that in parks D. halensis comprised over 40.8% of the total number of ground beetles, at closed landfill sites – 35.5%, in restored urban wetlands – 47.4%, in unmanaged grasslands – 44.1%, in forest parks – 4.1% (Do et al., 2014). At the same time, the species was completely absent from a brown field derelict area, gardens inside the interchange, and urban roadsides (Do et al., 2014). These variations in abundance could be connected either with anthropogenic activity or with natural ecological factors (biotic and abiotic). No attempt was made to distinguish these factors.
In Fennoscandia Lindroth (1985) mentions that the species occurs “on open, often cultivated fields, usually on clayey soil. It is a common species in agricultural regions of Eastern Europe and is a pronounced steppe element in our fauna.” In the Czech Republic and Slovakia it is “common to sporadic on dry to moderately dry, unshaded habitats: fields; lowlands to hills” (Hůrka, 1996). Sigida (1993) considers *D. halensis* to be a polytopic mesophile, characteristic of natural steppe and pastureland, bairaks and floodplain forest, agricultural and urban landscapes. In Moldova *D. halensis* is a mesophile, belonging to the meadow-field group, abundant on fields in floodplains and dry interfluvials, uncommon in vinyards and nut orchards (Karpova and Matalin, 1993).

**A. dorsalis**


Lindroth (1974) states that in Great Britain *A. dorsalis* “is the least hygrophilous of all *Agonum*, occurring in open meadows and grassland, usually on gravelly or clayish, often chalky soil. Somewhat local but often abundant; often large aggregations under stones in spring”. In Fennoscandia according to Lindroth (1985) “the least hygrophilous of all *Agonum*, occurring in open meadows and grassland, usually on gravelly or clayey, often limestone soil. Also on arable land, particularly in winter crops on heavy soil.” In the Czech Republic and Slovakia it is “very common in unshaded, dry to moderately moist habitats; fields, steppe, pastures, edges of small woods; from lowlands to mountains, often gregariously” (Hůrka, 1996).

In the Caucasus Sigida (1993) considers *A. dorsalis* to be a polytopic mesophile, typical of bairak and floodplain forest. In Moldova *A. dorsalis* is a mesophile, belonging to the meadow-field group, occurring infrequently on fields in floodplains and dry interfluvils, in vinyards and cherry orchards, isolated forest blocks (Karpova and Matalin, 1993). In the Non-Chernozem Area of Russia single specimens of *A. dorsalis* were caught in barley crops, winter wheat, beetroot and in forest ecosystems (Soboleva-Dokuchaeva, 1995).

*A. dorsalis* was found by Knapp and Uhnawa (2014) in drier open areas such as arable fields, meadows, dry grasslands (steppes), and gardens. According to Kocourek et al. (2013), *A. dorsalis* comprised 8.7% of the total number of carabid beetles collected from maize fields at the Prague-Ruzyné site (Central Bohemia), and 0.5% at Ivanovice na Hane site (Central Moravia). According to Baranovska et al. (2014), in the Czech Republic *A. dorsalis* occurs in open habitats and is common even in intensively managed agricultural landscapes. *A. dorsalis* is an important generalist predator feeding on aphids and other arthropod crop pests (Wratten and Vickerman, 1985; Bilde and Toft, 1994) and is thus considered a beneficial organism with biocontrol potential.

**L. krynickii**

A West Palaearctic species, ranging from the Elbe River to the Urals and Central Asia (Hůrka, 1996). In the former Soviet Union the range of *L. krynickii* extends across the European part, eastwards to the Altai (Kryzhanovskij et al., 1995). In Ukraine Puchkov (2012) states that it occurs in the forest zone, the broad-leaved forest zone and the forest-steppe zone. *L. krynickii* has not been recorded in Moldova (Karpova and Matalin, 1993).

In Fennoscandia according to the data of Lindroth (1985) the species is very rare in Denmark, and also in Sweden, where it is restricted to the southeast of the country. The species does not occur in Norway or East Fennoscandia. In Europe it is distributed as far as the Elbe and Central Italy in the west, and Leningrad region in the north, extending eastward into Siberia. The species is “decidedly stenotopic, being confined to dark and marshy habitats in mull-rich deciduous forests. The species typically occurs in rich vegetation, e.g. of *Filipendula ulmaria*. The species can be found in litter and undermoss and bark of tree stumps, etc, often together with *A. assimile*.”

Hůrka (1996) states that it is absent in Bohemia, rare to very rare in Moravia, rare to sporadic in the Slovak Republic, “a local; hygrophilous species of shaded borders of waters with rich vegetation in floodplain forests; lowlands.” In the Caucasus *L. krynickii* according to Sigida (1993) is a forest mesophile, occurring in bairak and floodplain forest, agricultural and urban landscapes.

**O. obscurus**

A Holarctic species (Hůrka, 1996). It is common in the European part of the former Soviet Union and Western Siberia, extending as far east as Lake Baikal (Kryzhanovskij et al., 1995). According to Puchkov (2012), in Ukraine it inhabits the forest and forest-steppe zones, and also the Crimean Mountains and their foothills (along with the south-eastern coastal strip). *O. obscurus* has not been recorded in Moldova (Karpova and Matalin, 1993). Serrano (2013) mentions that *O. obscurus* inhabits only 5 of Spain’s 23 regions.

Lindroth (1974) states that in Great Britain *O. obscurus* occurs “in damp deciduous forests and in densely vegetated marshes, among leaves and mosses”. In Fennoscandia according to Lindroth (1985) the species occurs “predominantly in deciduous and mixed forests, living in damp, shaded sites among litter and moss. It is particularly numerous in stands of alder and ash in forest swamps, occurring among wet leaves around trees and stumps. Less abundant in peaty woods between pillows.
of Sphagnum. Also in densely vegetated marshes in open country”.

In the Czech Republic and Slovakia it is “common
in floodplain forests and among dense vegetation of
edges of marshes and waters, from lowlands to hills”
(Hůrka, 1996). In the Non-Chernozem Area of Russia
O. obscurus has been recorded (scattered specimens) only
in forest ecosystems (Soboleva-Dorokhova, 1995). In
the Caucasus O. obscurus Sigida (1993) is considered
part of the stagnophilous, hygrophilous complex, being
a typical inhabitant of marshes and waterlogged, open
floodplains. In Hungary, in a lowland oak forest-grassland
complex (Tóthmérész et al., 2014) O. obscurus proved
to be a highly reliable indicator of edge ecosystems. This
ground beetle species swims well, having been observed
to survive for up to 22 days on the surface of water
(Kolesnikov et al., 2012). This feature of its biology
enables it to survive in floodplain rivers, far from the
banks. Investigations in the north of its range, on Oland
island situated in the Baltic Sea, showed that O. obscurus
is one of the most abundant species of ground beetle,
both in forest and meadow habitat (Andersen, 2011).
In the steppe zone of Ukraine O. obscurus is at its most
numerous in broad-leaved forests, in moist, shady areas
with a deep litter layer and acid sandy soil.

Fine differences in the habitat preferences of species
can be assessed not only by the average value for a spe-
cies in relation to a specific factor. It is also important
to assess the range of tolerance of a species in relation to that
particular factor. The presentation of data in this paper in
graph form can be used both for comparison of ecological
preferences of different species of ground beetle and for
assessment of general tolerance of species groups sharing
the same ecosystem and for comparisons between ecosys-
tems (Brygadyrenko, 2003b).

Adoption of the research methods used for this ar-
ticle allows a clear multiple level assessment to be made
of the ecological niches of different species of ground
beetle. The results of a quantitative assessment of the eco-
systemic preferences of different species can vary under the
influence of climatic zone.

Conclusions

In the forests of the steppe zone of Ukraine C. ambigus
is a typical mesophile, with a slight preference for pine
forests. C. erratus is at its most numerous in xerome-
sophilous moisture conditions with an average abundance
of ants. C. fuscipes favours broad-leaved forests with
40–80% tree crown density, a sparse herbaceous layer,
and clay soil with high salinity. C. melanocephalus is at
its most numerous in forests with a deep litter layer with
average soil salinity. D. halensis is often found in forests
with low crown density and favours areas with high sa-
linity. A. dorsalis favours plots with scattered trees, thick
grass, mesophilous moisture conditions and low abund-
ance of ants. L. krynickii inhabits forests with a thin lit-
ter layer, hygrophilous moisture conditions and soils with
low salinity. O. obscurus inhabits moist areas of forests
with acid, sandy soil.
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Comparison of the andosols properties of forest and meadow ecosystems on the neovolcanic rocks of the Central Slovakia
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Abstract

The aim of the paper was to describe the chemical and physical characteristics of the mixed forest soils and to compare their characteristics with meadow soils (mowed and xerothermic) situated at selected volcanic mountains of Central Slovakia. The andosols analysed were taken from the Kremnické and the Štiavnické mountains. The chemical and physical characteristics of andosols have been monitored. It was proved that in the mixed forests there is a constant input of fresh organic matter which affects the content of total organic carbon (TOC) and keeps it at a steady level. The highest value variability of TOC among seasons and the highest average value of TOC were proved to be in xerothermic meadows (8.93 ± 4.49%). The land use has a statistically significant impact on the differences between the values of active pH (F = 7.5001, p = 0.001) and exchangeable soil reaction (F = 18.8866, p = 0.000). Total nitrogen (N_t) was affected by land use and was decreasing from xerothermic meadows to mixed forests (p < 0.001) in linear dependence similar to the TOC content (F = 11.7573, p = 0.000). The value variabilities of cation exchange capacity (CEC) and basic cation (S) between soils of mixed forest and mowed and xerothermic meadows were statistically significant. The content of TOC negatively correlated with the sand fraction (soils of the mixed forest and xerothermic meadow) and the clay fraction (soils of monitored ecosystems).
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Introduction
Andosols represent a unique body of soil types in Slovakia that is part of the national heritage. Moreover, they are part of European volcanic soils (Juráni and Balkovič, 2007). The genesis of andic properties and characteristics is determined by the natural soil-forming factors in the following order: rock-time-climate-relief-vegetation (Balkovič, 2002). The soils formed from volcanic materials, which contain a large amount of soil organic carbon (SOC) due to their stabilization, belong to mineral soils (Armas-Herrera, 2012; Mora et al., 2014). Andosols have a specific morphology and specific physical and chemical properties (Novák et al., 2010). Andosols are soils with a large structural development and stability of aggregates. Their properties have a significant role in their high infiltration rate. However, they are affected by environmental changes,
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especially those related to changes of land use (Neris et al., 2012). The land use in practice can have a permanent effect on the distribution of nutrients in soil, and it can affect the natural recovery of the ecosystem at the end of the land use (Lai, 2000; Aleksandrowicz-Trzcińska, 2005; Sakbaeva et al., 2012, Gómory et al., 2015). Generally, the soils used for agriculture are not similar in terms of the chemical, physical and biological characteristics compared to forest soils (Malecka and Hilszczanka, 2014).

It is important to monitor not only the changes in the land management and landscape cover, but also the content of soil organic matter. It has ecological and environmental consequences (Slepetienè et al., 2010; Huđec and Hreško, 2012). Soil organic matter (SOM) is a determining factor of soil quality (Ryan, 1998; Gärdénäš et al., 2011; Ostrowska and Porebska, 2012). It has an important role in the soils of each ecosystem (Kalisz et al., 2010). It affects the chemical and physical properties of soil, such as the formation of stable aggregates, water retention, cation exchange capacity, nutrient content as well as nitrogen and carbon content (Kononova, 1966). Arrouays et al. (2001) and Navarrete et al. (2010) reported that the carbon cycle, biodiversity and soil fertility are influenced by land management, landscape cover and agriculture. In forest management, the soil has an important role, especially in the production of plant biomass. Sand density affects its structure, and can lead to changes of biogeomorphological characteristics (Pach et al., 2001), changes of biomass allocation (Jagodziński and Oleksyn, 2009a) and it can modify the retention of nutrients in biomass and soil (Jagodziński and Oleksyn, 2009b; Malecka and Hilszczanka, 2014). Soil organic matter is very important to all soil processes that have an impact on crop production and the environment (Ryan et al., 2008). The soil carbon losses from soil cause the reduction of organic matter, fertility, ability to retain water and frequent local dryness (Bierkens et al., 2008).

In recent years, the number of changes in the country has been increasing, which represents a risk for accumulation of carbon in the forest in terms of time and area. The type of vegetation cover of non-cultivated land is a factor that affects the organic carbon content of soil (Liu et al., 2010). Soil organic components are important factors of forest health and productivity (Jurgensen et al., 1997). The losses of forest cover affect the decrease of the SOC which occurs in advance of complete deforestation when degraded forests are transformed into pasture, cropland and eroded areas (Covaleda et al., 2011).

The aim of this study was to observe changes of the chemical and physical characteristics of the andosols soil type. Soil samples were collected from selected ecosystems (mixed forest, meadows: mowed and xerothermic) in different seasons (autumn, spring) during 2011–2013.

Material and methods

The study was located in Kremnické and Štiavnické mountains (Fig. 1). Kremnické and Štiavnické mountains are volcanic mountains that are located in Central Slovakia. It is part of the West Carpathians province, sub-province Inner Western Carpathians and the Slovak Central Mountains. It is important to define the correct position with respect to individual monitoring points for the sampling of soil. Soil samples were collected by a probe (10 sampling sites = 10 open borrow pits) from a depth of about 1 m in autumn of 2011, 2012 and spring of 2012, 2013. An open probe is used for determination of soil characteristics such as soil profile description, its depth, the stratigraphy (arrangement of genetic horizons) and morphological characteristics. A soil sample was taken from each sampling area (5 × 5 m) in a total of ten different locations (Table 1).

The sampling area was divided into regular grids. This provides a balanced surface covering of the land being surveyed and contributes to the achievement of objective results (Nozdrovický, 2008). The soil samples were taken from the terrestrial organogenic horizon OI (0–5 cm), Aau horizon (5–35 cm) and from Bva cambic andosols horizon (35–60 cm). Andosols were identified according to IUSS Working Group WRB (2006), on the basis of the dark-coloured, deep, fluffy, melanic, andic (Aa) horizon. Allophanes and grain size of soils were not evaluated.

Soil was air-dried at room temperature and sieved (<2 mm), and a sample was taken using standard procedures. Visible plant remnants were removed by hand. Soil reaction was determined in distilled water as active soil reaction (pH_W) and in a solution of 1 mol L–1 KCl as exchange soil reaction (pH_KCl). The ratio of soil and solution was 1 : 2.5 (Van Reeuwijk, 2002). Total organic carbon (TOC) was measured using the Tjurin method modified by Nikitina according to Orlov and Grišina (1981). The content of humic substances (HS), as well as the HA : FA ratio was determined by group composition of humic substances using the Belčíková-Kononová method (Kononová and Belčíková, 1962). Humic substances were extracted into a 0.1 mol L–1 solution of sodium pyrophosphate adjusted to pH = 13 with 1 mol L–1 sodium hydroxide and the samples were left for infusion for 24 hours at room temperature. To separate fulvic acids (FA) from humic acids (HA), the solution was centrifuged (10,000 rpm) and the precipitate containing HA was dissolved with sodium hydroxide. The total nitrogen (N()) was determined by the Kjeldahl method (Bremner, 1960), inorganic nitrogen (N()) as the sum of ammonium (N-NH₄) and nitrate (N-NO₃), while nitrogen was determined by the color method (Radow et al., 1985). Cation exchangeable capacity (CEC = H + S), base saturation (V = S / CEC × 100), hydrolytic acidity (H) and sum of basic cations (S) were measured according to Jackson (2005). Silt, sand and...
Table 1. Characteristics of monitoring places of soil samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Localization of andosols</th>
<th>Altitude (m o. s.)</th>
<th>Exploitation</th>
<th>Slope exposure</th>
<th>Slope of relief</th>
<th>Outflow conditions</th>
<th>Geomorphological division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>Mixed forest</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>≥25°</td>
<td>Strong outflow</td>
<td>Flochovský chrbát Mts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>Mixed forest</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>≥25°</td>
<td>Strong outflow</td>
<td>Kunešovská hornatina Mts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>Mixed forest</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>≥25°</td>
<td>Strong outflow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>Xerothermic meadow</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12°–17°</td>
<td>Poor outflow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>Mown meadow</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>12°–17°</td>
<td>Moderately strong outflow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>Mown meadow</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>12°–17°</td>
<td>Poor outflow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>Mown meadow</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>7°–12°</td>
<td>Poor outflow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>Mown meadow</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>7°–12°</td>
<td>Moderately strong outflow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>Xerothermic meadow</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>≥25°</td>
<td>Strong outflow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>Xerothermic meadow</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>12°–17°</td>
<td>Poor outflow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E, east; NW, north-west; S, south; SE, south-east.
clay fractions were determined using the pipette method (van Reeuwijk, 2002). The results are shown in the tables by averages from a depth of 0–60 cm.

The measured data was statistically processed using the software Statistics 8, a statistics program using parametric tests. The two-way ANOVA with interaction was used to compare the chemical and physicochemical properties of soil in terms of different seasons and ecosystems, with separation by means of Tukey’s HSD test. To determine the correlation relationships between chemical parameters, we used Spearman’s test of serial correlation.

Phytocenological research was realized during the years 2013 and 2014 based on the methods developed by the Zurich-Montpellier school (Braun-Blanquet, 1964) using the new Braun-Blanquet 9-member ordinal scale of coverage (Van der Maar, 1978). Bryophytes and lichens were not described. The sampling and described area was 5 × 5 m. Phytocenological records were saved in database software called Turboveg (Hennekens and Schaminé, 2001) and subsequently exported into the software JUICE (Tichý, 2002). For the classification of the entries, Twinspan (Hill, 1979) was also used in the software JUICE (Tichý, 2002) and the formally defined syntaxes in the work of Janišová et al. (2007). The names of taxa are listed according to the work of Marhold (1998). Syntax nomenclature is given by Jarolímk et al. (2008).

P1 – mixed forest, beech-spruce-hornbeam forest (age 150 years; cover crop; stand 285 B) 50% Abies alba, 45% Fagus sylvatica, 5% Acer pseudoplatanus

P2 – mixed forest, beech-spruce-hornbeam forest (age 140 years; cover crop; stand 347 B) 90% Fagus sylvatica, 10% Abies alba

P3 – mixed forest, beech-spruce-hornbeam forest (age 55 years; cover crop; stand 283 B) 70% Fagus sylvatica, 10% Acer pseudoplatanus, 10% Abies alba, 10% Picea abies

P4 – acid-loving mesophytic meadow e. g. Arrhenatherion elatioris, mowed

P5 – mesophytic meadow e. g. Arrhenatherion elatioris

P6 – coppice with transient character, where the species overlap mesophytic meadows e.g. Arrhenatherion elatioris and sub-xerophytic lawns for example Bromion erecti

P7 – mesophytic meadow e. g. Arrhenatherion elatioris

P8 – mesophytic meadow e. g. Arrhenatherion elatioris

P9 – coppice with transient character, in which the elements of thermophilic hems grow, for example Geranion sanguinei, sub-xerophytic lawns for example Bromion erecti, or species of mesophytic meadows e. g. Arrhenatherion elatioris, mowed

P10 – ecotonic ecosystem e. g. Geranion sanguinei, mowed

Results and discussion

The chemical and physical characteristics of soils under different land uses are shown in Tables 2a–c. The highest average value of total organic carbon (TOC) was detected on xerothermic meadows (8.93 ± 4.94%) in autumn 2011, with the highest values of difference in this land use situation (Fig. 2). The lowest difference in terms of TOC values, between the periods in which soil was sampled, was detected in mixed forest (Fig. 2). The content of TOC in the mown meadow soil showed increasing values during the entire period from autumn 2011 to autumn 2012. In the spring of 2013, there was a decrease of TOC content from 7.42 ± 6.01% to 5.15 ± 3.00%. The TOC content in the soils of the mixed forest and the xerothermic meadow decreased in spring 2013 but not in the same season in 2012.

The TOC content in soil was influenced not only by land use. According to Martelotto (2010), climate affects plant growth and yield, and it mediates decomposition rates, thus impacting on the quantity and rate of C cycling. Management practices will alter this balance by affecting the system’s productivity, and the speed of residue and soil organic matter decomposition. The TOC content of forest soils is lower than that of other land use types. It is said that the enrichment of afforested soils by organic substrates in the form of compost and mining residues on the one hand improves the fertility of the poor soils, but on the other hand it stimulates beneficial microbial processes in the environment, increases the proportion of antagonists and also the resistance to infection in the roots of a young forest ecosystem (Kwaśna et al., 2000, 2001).

The central European forestry has started an ecologically-oriented conversion of spruce monocultures to broadleaf and mixed forests (Galka et al., 2014). We monitored the soils of a mixed forest of beech-spruce-hornbeam. With regard to the seasonal impact (autumn/spring), we did not detect statistically significant differences in TOC content (F = 2.8697, p = 0.095). According to Islam and Weil (2000), the total C (TOC) levels tended to be higher in reforested and grassland sites, but the variability was not high enough. Even Gundoğan et al. (2011) did not detect statistically significant differences in TOC between grassland, forest and arable land. Mutsotsos and Muya (2008) also detected a higher TOC content on natural grassland, as well as on natural forest. Changes in TOC content were influenced by different factors and had divergent behaviour depending on the type of habitat and the stand density. In forests, the dynamics of the density are dependent on the species, the quality of the locality (in terms of soil), and other factors (Socha...
Table 2a. Mixed forest – average values of soil chemical properties (mean value ± standard deviation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemical properties</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>4.91 ± 1.86</td>
<td>4.30 ± 2.06</td>
<td>3.99 ± 1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH&lt;sub&gt;H₂O&lt;/sub&gt; (%)</td>
<td>5.82 ± 0.46</td>
<td>5.97 ± 0.28</td>
<td>6.14 ± 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH&lt;sub&gt;KCl&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.73 ± 0.30</td>
<td>5.06 ± 0.40</td>
<td>4.68 ± 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NH₄⁺ (mg kg⁻¹)</td>
<td>13.03 ± 3.38</td>
<td>19.75 ± 4.27</td>
<td>16.70 ± 3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NO₃⁻ (mg kg⁻¹)</td>
<td>8.07 ± 2.15</td>
<td>9.13 ± 2.58</td>
<td>8.57 ± 1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nₚ</td>
<td>21.10 ± 4.59</td>
<td>28.88 ± 6.82</td>
<td>25.27 ± 4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nₜ</td>
<td>4.13 ± 1.92</td>
<td>3.43 ± 2.12</td>
<td>2.90 ± 1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS (%)</td>
<td>4.45 ± 0.85</td>
<td>3.67 ± 1.07</td>
<td>3.60 ± 0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA (%)</td>
<td>1.95 ± 0.45</td>
<td>1.56 ± 0.41</td>
<td>1.65 ± 0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>2.49 ± 0.43</td>
<td>2.11 ± 0.68</td>
<td>1.95 ± 0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA : FA</td>
<td>0.78 ± 0.10</td>
<td>0.76 ± 0.12</td>
<td>0.85 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C : N</td>
<td>12.51 ± 1.48</td>
<td>13.92 ± 2.63</td>
<td>14.45 ± 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H (cmol kg⁻¹)</td>
<td>14.30 ± 1.59</td>
<td>13.24 ± 1.34</td>
<td>13.32 ± 1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>10.57 ± 3.97</td>
<td>9.85 ± 2.87</td>
<td>9.10 ± 1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>24.87 ± 2.53</td>
<td>23.12 ± 1.67</td>
<td>22.42 ± 1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V (%)</td>
<td>41.33 ± 11.91</td>
<td>41.95 ± 9.81</td>
<td>40.48 ± 5.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOC, total organic carbon; pH<sub>H₂O</sub>, active soil reaction; pH<sub>KCl</sub>, exchange soil reaction; N-NH₄⁺, ammonium nitrogen; N-NO₃⁻, nitrate nitrogen; Nₚ, inorganic nitrogen; Nₜ, total nitrogen; HS, humic substance; HA, humic acid; FA, fulvic acid; H, hydrolytic acidity; S, basic cation; CEC, cation exchange capacity; V, base saturation.

Table 2b. Mown meadow – average values of soil chemical properties (mean value ± standard deviation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemical properties</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>2.85 ± 1.59</td>
<td>4.65 ± 2.99</td>
<td>7.42 ± 6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH&lt;sub&gt;H₂O&lt;/sub&gt; (%)</td>
<td>5.77 ± 0.49</td>
<td>5.41 ± 0.10</td>
<td>5.75 ± 0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH&lt;sub&gt;KCl&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.46 ± 0.22</td>
<td>4.48 ± 0.10</td>
<td>4.49 ± 0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NH₄⁺ (mg kg⁻¹)</td>
<td>9.80 ± 7.25</td>
<td>52.88 ± 24.37</td>
<td>27.62 ± 6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NO₃⁻ (mg kg⁻¹)</td>
<td>4.92 ± 0.68</td>
<td>7.63 ± 1.79</td>
<td>8.37 ± 2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nₚ</td>
<td>14.72 ± 7.66</td>
<td>60.52 ± 25.65</td>
<td>35.98 ± 6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nₜ</td>
<td>3.25 ± 1.88</td>
<td>5.20 ± 3.70</td>
<td>11.73 ± 9.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS (%)</td>
<td>3.05 ± 0.90</td>
<td>3.12 ± 1.40</td>
<td>3.32 ± 1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA (%)</td>
<td>1.15 ± 0.30</td>
<td>1.03 ± 0.35</td>
<td>1.24 ± 0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>1.90 ± 0.65</td>
<td>2.90 ± 1.08</td>
<td>2.09 ± 0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA : FA</td>
<td>0.71 ± 0.37</td>
<td>0.77 ± 0.58</td>
<td>0.73 ± 0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C : N</td>
<td>9.68 ± 1.91</td>
<td>9.72 ± 1.50</td>
<td>7.70 ± 3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H (cmol kg⁻¹)</td>
<td>6.57 ± 1.83</td>
<td>5.27 ± 0.66</td>
<td>3.63 ± 0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>7.22 ± 1.61</td>
<td>5.92 ± 0.86</td>
<td>5.53 ± 1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>13.78 ± 3.39</td>
<td>11.18 ± 1.36</td>
<td>9.17 ± 1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V (%)</td>
<td>52.70 ± 2.92</td>
<td>52.81 ± 3.25</td>
<td>59.97 ± 4.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOC, total organic carbon; pH<sub>H₂O</sub>, active soil reaction; pH<sub>KCl</sub>, exchange soil reaction; N-NH₄⁺, ammonium nitrogen; N-NO₃⁻, nitrate nitrogen; Nₚ, inorganic nitrogen; Nₜ, total nitrogen; HS, humic substance; HA, humic acid; FA, fulvic acid; H, hydrolytic acidity; S, basic cation; CEC, cation exchange capacity; V, base saturation.
Table 2c. Xerothermic meadow – average values of soil chemical properties (mean value ± standard deviation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemical properties</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autumn</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Autumn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC (%)</td>
<td>8.93 ± 4.94</td>
<td>5.27 ± 2.20</td>
<td>7.43 ± 3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH_{H_2O}</td>
<td>5.26 ± 0.90</td>
<td>5.15 ± 0.36</td>
<td>5.70 ± 0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH_{KCl}</td>
<td>4.04 ± 0.33</td>
<td>3.96 ± 0.22</td>
<td>4.21 ± 0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NH₄⁺ (mg kg⁻¹)</td>
<td>26.30 ± 21.64</td>
<td>69.80 ± 36.76</td>
<td>34.63 ± 16.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NO₃⁻ (mg kg⁻¹)</td>
<td>6.83 ± 4.50</td>
<td>5.65 ± 1.34</td>
<td>7.48 ± 1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nᵢᵣ (mg kg⁻¹)</td>
<td>33.13 ± 24.83</td>
<td>75.45 ± 37.79</td>
<td>42.11 ± 17.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nₜ (mg kg⁻¹)</td>
<td>16.54 ± 8.90</td>
<td>9.03 ± 3.08</td>
<td>13.13 ± 5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS (%)</td>
<td>4.50 ± 2.27</td>
<td>4.62 ± 1.63</td>
<td>4.21 ± 3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA (%)</td>
<td>0.82 ± 0.53</td>
<td>1.45 ± 0.34</td>
<td>0.82 ± 0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA (%)</td>
<td>3.68 ± 1.88</td>
<td>3.17 ± 1.30</td>
<td>3.39 ± 3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA : FA</td>
<td>0.31 ± 0.23</td>
<td>0.50 ± 0.10</td>
<td>0.59 ± 0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C : N</td>
<td>5.22 ± 0.67</td>
<td>5.72 ± 0.54</td>
<td>5.52 ± 0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H (cmol kg⁻¹)</td>
<td>5.10 ± 0.89</td>
<td>3.80 ± 0.54</td>
<td>3.55 ± 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (cmol kg⁻¹)</td>
<td>7.25 ± 1.42</td>
<td>5.28 ± 0.84</td>
<td>4.68 ± 1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC (%)</td>
<td>12.35 ± 2.19</td>
<td>9.08 ± 1.36</td>
<td>8.23 ± 2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V (%)</td>
<td>59.50 ± 2.92</td>
<td>58.08 ± 1.44</td>
<td>57.48 ± 4.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOC, total organic carbon; pH_{H_2O}, active soil reaction; pH_{KCl}, exchange soil reaction; N-NH₄⁺, ammonium nitrogen; N-NO₃⁻, nitrate nitrogen; Nᵢᵣ, inorganic nitrogen; Nₜ, total nitrogen; HS, humic substance; HA, humic acid; FA, fulvic acid; H, hydrolytic acidity; S, base cation; CEC, cation exchange capacity; V, base saturation.

Fig. 2. Variability of TOC (total organic carbon) depending on the land use in different years.
and Zasada, 2014). The highest variability in terms of values between seasons was detected in the case of xerothermic meadows (Table 3), probably because of the fresh organic substance supply during the whole year.

Land use had a statistically significant impact on difference in active values (F = 7.5001, p = 0.001) and exchange soil reaction (F = 18.8866, p = 0.000) (Table 4). According to Islam and Weil (2000), the pH values of the natural forest, reforested land, grassland and cultivated soils, varied significantly. A drop in pH values was also indicative of the process of soil transformation (Kalisz et al., 2010). Gündoğan et al. (2011) detected statistically significant differences in the values of active soil reaction between grassland, forest and arable land, while grassland had significantly higher pH than both forest and arable lands (p < 0.05). The drop in soil acidity and the nitrogen deposition in the context of contemporary climate change will limit the silvicultural function of forest communities (Janík et al., 2014). The soils of xerothermic and mown meadows on the neovolcanic rocks of central Slovakia were significantly more acidic than that of the mixed forest (p < 0.05), probably because of the highest average TOC content in the soil, and eventually because of the high content of basic cations in the soil of the mixed forest.

The content of ammonia nitrogen (N-NH₄⁺), originating during the biological decomposition of organic samples in soil, was influenced not only by different types of ecosystem, but also by the season (F = 13.2885, p = 0.001) (Table 4).

Total nitrogen (Nₜ) was affected by the land use and decreased from xerothermic meadows to the mixed forests (p < 0.001) following a pattern similar to that shown by TOC (F = 11.7573, p = 0.000). Soil organic C and N have been proposed as useful indicators of soil quality (Arshad and Coen, 1992). A statistically significant difference in the values of Nₜ was also detected between individual seasons (p < 0.01) (F = 8.0201, p = 0.006). This was probably associated with a different rate of mineralization of the plant material fallout, and the intensity of nutrient uptake by plants (Bielsinska et al., 2008). Mutual interaction of factors of the land use and seasonal differences also affect the content of Nₜ between ecosystems (natural forest, reforested land, grassland, cultivated land). The impact between total C and N depends on the type of ecosystem (F = 46.753, p = 0.000) on the importance level α = 0.001, which does not correlate with the Islam and Weil (2000) results, but partially correlates with the results of Wróbel et al. (2012). A positive correlation was found between the total nitrogen and inorganic nitrogen content but this was not statistically significant (r = 0.428). In the soil of mixed forests, we found a positive correlation between total nitrogen and inorganic nitrogen (r = 0.618) at a significance level of α = 0.05. A correlation between total and inorganic nitrogen in the soil of the mown meadow (r = 0.274, p = 0.158) and the xerothermic meadow (r = 0.311, p = 0.170) was not found. Using the variance analysis, we found statistically significant differences in the content of inorganic nitrogen for different ecosystems (F = 7.3197, p = 0.0013) (Table 4).

Table 3. Mineral fraction composition of the studied andosols soil types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Sand (%)</th>
<th>Clay (%)</th>
<th>Silt (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed forest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Autumn</td>
<td>45.83 ± 7.21</td>
<td>19.59 ± 4.97</td>
<td>34.48 ± 7.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Spring</td>
<td>45.83 ± 3.03</td>
<td>18.90 ± 2.83</td>
<td>35.27 ± 2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Autumn</td>
<td>50.13 ± 4.65</td>
<td>17.98 ± 3.29</td>
<td>31.88 ± 7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Spring</td>
<td>48.73 ± 3.17</td>
<td>13.77 ± 4.00</td>
<td>37.50 ± 5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mown meadow</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Autumn</td>
<td>39.22 ± 8.43</td>
<td>30.85 ± 3.77</td>
<td>29.93 ± 8.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Spring</td>
<td>36.72 ± 8.47</td>
<td>32.97 ± 6.45</td>
<td>30.30 ± 6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Autumn</td>
<td>38.07 ± 9.17</td>
<td>33.57 ± 4.96</td>
<td>28.37 ± 11.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Spring</td>
<td>27.40 ± 5.88</td>
<td>33.75 ± 8.61</td>
<td>38.85 ± 7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Xerothermic meadow</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Autumn</td>
<td>44.30 ± 6.08</td>
<td>13.13 ± 3.14</td>
<td>42.58 ± 4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Spring</td>
<td>39.23 ± 5.93</td>
<td>10.40 ± 6.13</td>
<td>50.38 ± 1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Autumn</td>
<td>44.63 ± 7.49</td>
<td>15.98 ± 7.37</td>
<td>39.40 ± 3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Spring</td>
<td>34.56 ± 11.85</td>
<td>27.66 ± 18.45</td>
<td>40.96 ± 19.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sand – mineral particles of ø 2,000–50 µm; Clay – mineral particles of Ø < 2 µm; Silt – mineral particles of ø 50–2 µm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
<th>Significant level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>2.8697</td>
<td>0.094904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>1.9329</td>
<td>0.152717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>1.7632</td>
<td>0.179355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH_{H_{2}O}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>0.5990</td>
<td>0.441695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>7.5001</td>
<td>0.001150**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>0.3258</td>
<td>0.723118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH_{KCl}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>3.4283</td>
<td>0.068496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>18.8866</td>
<td>0.000000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>0.8907</td>
<td>0.415154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NH_{4}^{+}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>13.2885</td>
<td>0.000522***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>9.3602</td>
<td>0.000260***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>2.0964</td>
<td>0.074767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NO_{3}^{-}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>1.5472</td>
<td>0.217884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>3.1105</td>
<td>0.051075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>1.2948</td>
<td>0.280725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_{n}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>12.8053</td>
<td>0.000648***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>7.3197</td>
<td>0.001333**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>2.4611</td>
<td>0.093025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_{T}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>8.0201</td>
<td>0.006103**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>1.7573</td>
<td>0.000042***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>3.5117</td>
<td>0.035454*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>2.5397</td>
<td>0.115723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>2.5041</td>
<td>0.089374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>0.0620</td>
<td>0.939957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>2.4587</td>
<td>0.121585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>16.7532</td>
<td>0.000001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>2.3766</td>
<td>0.100650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>1.9624</td>
<td>0.165871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>3.9019</td>
<td>0.024949*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>0.7402</td>
<td>0.480893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>3.1800</td>
<td>0.079093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>318.4540</td>
<td>0.000000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>0.0200</td>
<td>0.980594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>4.3164</td>
<td>0.041582*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>26.1312</td>
<td>0.000000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>0.0223</td>
<td>0.977990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>6.8150</td>
<td>0.011145*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>191.3430</td>
<td>0.000000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>0.0170</td>
<td>0.982678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>0.9270</td>
<td>0.339140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>56.4080</td>
<td>0.000000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>0.1990</td>
<td>0.819754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>6.6883</td>
<td>0.011884*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>2.8143</td>
<td>0.067049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>2.8211</td>
<td>0.066629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Variance analysis of soil chemical characteristics depending on the land use and season with the mutual interaction – continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
<th>Significant level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>2.7144</td>
<td>0.104129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>1.1524</td>
<td>0.322073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>1.1436</td>
<td>0.324798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>3.0175</td>
<td>0.086967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>2.7779</td>
<td>0.069340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>2.7664</td>
<td>0.070084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem</td>
<td>12.5000</td>
<td>0.000025***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons-Ecosystem</td>
<td>3.7000</td>
<td>0.029227*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences at ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05.

TOC, total organic carbon; pH<sub>soil</sub>, active soil reaction; pH<sub>KCl</sub>, exchange soil reaction; N-NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>, ammonium nitrogen; N-NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, nitrate nitrogen; N<sub>i</sub>, inorganic nitrogen; N<sub>t</sub>, total nitrogen; HS, humic substance; HA, humic acid; FA, fulvic acid; H, hydrolytic acidity; S, basic cation; CEC, cation exchange capacity; V, base saturation.

The mineralization of organic carbon compounds was also demonstrated by the C : N ratio (Kalisz et al., 2010; Małecka and Hilszczanka, 2014). The C : N ratio dropped from about 13 : 15 in the mixed forest to below 8 : 10 in the mown meadow and 5 : 9 in the xerothermic meadow (Table 2). The C : N ratio showed a negative correlation with the inorganic nitrogen (r = −0.321) for all types of landscape with a significance level of α = 0.05. Soils with a lower C : N ratio have a greater potential to decompose organic material and to release plant nutrients (N, P, K, etc.) into the soil environment (Koçyği, Rice, 2004). Mineralization is a primarily biological process that converts organic N in decomposing litter to inorganic N in the form of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> (Paul and Clark, 1996). It can provide up to 75% of the mineral N input in forest soil (Berendse et al., 1989). As for decomposition in general, pH, moisture, temperature, and in particular, soil C and N concentrations, and the C : N ratio of the litter material, seem to have the strongest influence on the mineralization rates (Andersson et al., 2002; Booth et al., 2005). When decomposing substrates with a high C : N ratio, microorganisms will retain more inorganic N (mainly as NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) during decomposition, thus reducing the availability of this N pool to plants. Conversely, if the C : N ratio of the substrate is lower than that of the decomposers, microorganisms will increase the size of the mineralized N pool in the soil (Belzayid et al., 2013).

Even though that difference in TOC content is not impacted by land use, there is a statistically significant difference between individual humic fractions, in terms of humic acid (HA) (F = 16.7532, p = 0.000) and fulvic acid (FA) (F = 3.9019, p = 0.025). The connection between HA : FA was not detected as being influenced by land use (F = 1.0016, p = 0.372). Connexion of HA : FA in andosols represented values averaging 0.700. In Kobza’s (2008) opinion with regard to andosols, there is a high humic content and, despite its quality, there is a relatively low HA : FA < 1. However, little information is available on the impact of different methods of application in terms of HS on nutrient status, especially in the soil and climate conditions of the temperate zone (Osvalde et al., 2012).

The soil of a forest ecosystem (mixed forest) has been based on the detected values (cations exchangeable capacity and the sum of basic cations) to the soil with the highest sorption capacity (Tables 2a–c). Variability in terms of the values of CEC and S between a forest ecosystem (mixed forest) and a meadow ecosystem (mown and xerothermic meadows) was statistically significant (Table 4). Hydrolytic acidity was positively correlated to humic substances (humic acid and fulvic acid) in the forest ecosystem.

The sand (36.28 %) and silt (40.07 %) are dominant in the case of grain size of the andosol soil (Table 3). According to Kobza (2008), the fraction 0.002–0.05 mm (silt) and 0.05–2 mm (sand) dominates in the whole soil profile. According to Covalde et al. (2011) the determination of particle-size fractions is useful in studying the effect of land use change on soil carbon stocks, but few studies have been carried out to determine the effect of forest cover depletion on particle-size fractions, and even less so in volcanic soils. Based on our results, land use did not have a statistically significant influence on grain soil structure, which does not agree with the argument of Agoume and Birang (2009), who state that land-use systems significantly affect the clay, silt and sand fractions. The organic matter content of the soil is in positive correlation with the clay fraction (Boxatta and Agren, 1997). In our case, TOC was negatively correlated to sand fraction in the
soil of the mixed forest ($r = -0.408$, $p < 0.05$), and in soil of the xerothermic meadow. Within all observed and examined ecosystems, we detected a negative correlation between TOC and clay fraction ($r = -0.230$, $p < 0.05$). Tomásová et al. (2012) and Pan et al. (2013) detected a negative correlation between TOC and sand fraction, and a positive correlation between silt and clay fractions. The TOC of grassland (mown and xerothermic meadows) was positively correlated with $N_T$ ($r = 0.960$, $p < 0.05$), which is comparable to the argument of Pan et al. (2013). In the case of mown meadows, with the help of correlation analysis between the

Table 5. The correlation between the parameters of carbon and nitrogen, and parameters of sorption complex, soil reaction and soil fractions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecosystems</th>
<th>pH$_{act}$</th>
<th>pH$_{pH}$</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>CEC</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Sand</th>
<th>Clay</th>
<th>Silt</th>
<th>Texture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.567*</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>-0.178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.257</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>-0.235</td>
<td>-0.314</td>
<td>-0.213</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.529*</td>
<td>-0.331</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>-0.323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.228</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.344</td>
<td>-0.335</td>
<td>-0.181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.568*</td>
<td>-0.374</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.357</td>
<td>-0.194</td>
<td>0.407*</td>
<td>-0.299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>-0.206</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.483*</td>
<td>0.432*</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.367</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.170</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>-0.385</td>
<td>-0.323</td>
<td>-0.360</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.474*</td>
<td>-0.282</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>-0.326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>-0.140</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XM</td>
<td>-0.401</td>
<td>-1.010</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>-0.431</td>
<td>-0.299</td>
<td>-0.278</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NH$_4^+$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>-0.364</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>-0.205</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.252</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>-0.272</td>
<td>-0.333</td>
<td>-0.233</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-NO$_3^-$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.582*</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.387</td>
<td>-0.276</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>-0.199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XM</td>
<td>-0.322</td>
<td>-0.298</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>-0.165</td>
<td>-0.123</td>
<td>-0.244</td>
<td>-0.220</td>
<td>-0.170</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N$_t$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>-0.344</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
<td>-0.138</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>-0.188</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.264</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>-0.280</td>
<td>-0.336</td>
<td>-0.237</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N$_T$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>-0.333</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>-0.151</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>-0.309</td>
<td>-0.317</td>
<td>-0.241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA:FA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>0.530*</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>-0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XM</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>-0.385</td>
<td>-0.434</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.917*</td>
<td>0.563*</td>
<td>-0.222</td>
<td>-0.230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C : N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>-0.256</td>
<td>-0.397</td>
<td>0.446*</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.487*</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>-0.227</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XM</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.532*</td>
<td>-0.366</td>
<td>-0.238</td>
<td>-0.301</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.845*</td>
<td>0.558*</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences at *$p < 0.05$.

MF, mixed forest; MM, mown meadow; XM, xerothermic meadow; TOC, total organic carbon; pH$_{act}$, active soil reaction; pH$_{pH}$, exchange soil reaction; N-NH$_4^+$, ammonium nitrogen; N-NO$_3^-$, nitrate nitrogen; N$_t$, inorganic nitrogen; N$_T$, total nitrogen; HS, humic substance; HA, humic acid; FA, fulvic acid; H, hydrolytic acidity; S, basic cation; CEC, cation exchange capacity; V, base saturation.
parameters of carbon and nitrogen and the parameters of sorption complex, soil reaction and fractions on the different ecosystems, we detected a negative influence of the clay fraction on the content of humic substances (Table 5). The clay fraction was negatively correlated with humic acids \( r = -0.550, p < 0.05 \) and also with fulvic acids \( r = -0.440, p < 0.05 \).

Conclusions

The highest average TOC and basic cations content were in the soil of the mixed forest. The xerothermic and mown meadows were more acidic \( (p < 0.05) \) than the soil of the mixed forest. In our case, the land use did not influence the TOC values \( (F = 1.933, p = 0.153) \). Humic substances are typical products of humifical transformations. The process of humification is contingent on a whole line of environmental and ecological factors. Locality, soil type, slope relief, season, climate, altitude and also the use of ground cover have a huge impact on the whole process. Statistically significant differences between the monitored ecosystems were found in terms of the humic acid \( (F = 16.753, p = 0.000) \) and the fulvic acid content \( (F = 3.9019, p = 0.025) \). One of the reasons for the creation of humic substances are different herbal and zoological remainders entering the humification process. Humic acids are present in all herbs, soils and animals, and they are a natural part of the food chain, and undertake unchangeable tasks during the transformation of lifeless substances into nutriments. In the mixed forest soil we determined the minimal differences in the TOC content during the monitoring period 2011–2013 (spring, autumn). This is thanks to the regular supply of organic matter in the forest soil from the root system and logging residues.

In the soil of the mixed forest, we found a positive correlation between total nitrogen and inorganic nitrogen \( (r = 0.618) \) at a significance level of \( \alpha = 0.05 \). A significant correlation between total and inorganic nitrogen in the soil of the mown meadow \( (r = 0.274, p = 0.158) \) and the xerothermic meadow \( (r = 0.311, p = 0.170) \) was not found. The most important transformations of nitrogen in soil relate to the biological N fixation, which positively affects the forest ecosystem. Nitrogen is bound directly into the soil through the roots.

The forest ecosystem has an important role in the carbon cycle through the transformation of inorganic carbon to organic carbon as well as in the process of accumulation that consists of sequestration, humification and decomposition, which lead to the formation of carbon stocks in the deeper layers of the soil.

Acknowledgement

This work was co-funded by European Community in the frame of project No. 26220220180: Building Research Centre „AgroBioTech” and by the University Grant Agency (Grant No. VIII/10/2015).

References


BERENDSE, F., BOBBINK, R., ROUWENHORST, G., 1989. A comparative study on nutrient cycling in wet heath-


Pan, Ch., Zhao, H., Zhao, X., Han, H., Wang, Y., Li, J., 2013. Biophysical properties as determinants for


Received July 16, 2015

Accepted November 19, 2015
Impact of weather and habitat on the occurrence of centipedes, millipedes and terrestrial isopods in mountain spruce forests
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Abstract

Microclimatic factors (air temperature, soil temperature and moisture in the Ah and B horizons) were determined using AMET weather stations and VIRRIB sensors on four sites in the Moravian-Silesian Beskids (Czech Republic) in 2007–2014. Simultaneously, pitfall traps were installed to monitor epigeic activity of myriapoda (Diplopoda and Chilopoda) and terrestrial isopods (Oniscidea). No statistically significant relationship was found between the occurrence of epigeic macrofauna and the microclimate of the studied forest stands. A linear curve was fitted to the data, demonstrating an increase in air temperature by 2.9 °C and a decrease in moisture by 4.49% over the eight years of monitoring. In this period, the catch of the studied groups of macrofauna decreased while the diversity of the monitored communities increased. Increasing temperature led to the occurrence of synanthropic species Porcellio scaber and the decline of montane centipede species such as Lithobius tenebriferus and Lithobius borealis.
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Introduction
In the past few decades, the course of weather has been regarded as a factor of the environment which is undergoing global change affecting the ecosystems. These changes are quantified on the basis of direct measurement of climatic factors and indirectly through the response of fauna and flora. The influence of climate on soil fauna was monitored through myriapods and terrestrial isopods, which are known to react sensitively to developing site conditions – both to changes in temperature and decreasing moisture (Auerbach, 1949; Fründ, 1987; Blower, 1951; Lewis, 1981). The abundance and diversity of edaphic zoocenosis depends on soil moisture content as affected by thickness of the surface humus (Jabin, 2008) or by snow cover depth (Templer et al., 2012). It is presumed that the rising temperature may not only increase the abundance of invertebrates but also extend their distribution area and the ability to reproduce (Rodenhous et al., 2009; Ladanyi and Horvath, 2010). The influence of snow cover on the centipede community in the permafrost conditions of the northern parts of the USA was described by Templer et al. (2012). Myriapods are confirmed to have a wide temperature tolerance (0–32 °C) (Pfieiderer-Gruber, 1986), allowing the representatives of centipedes to remain at the temperature –3 °C for the period of 7 days (Lavy and Verhoef, 1996). Some species require low temperature limits to develop larval stages (between –6 and +3 °C) (Topr, 1994). Low snow
depth or late arrival of snow cause freezing of the upper soil layers, which can induce changes in the quantity of edaphic macrofauna (BALE and HAYWARD, 2010). Changes in the quantity of edaphic macrofauna may be related to deviations in the amount of carbon and its cycle or the nutrient content in forest soils, since the majority of its representatives significantly contribute to the decomposition of organic matter (TEMPLER et al., 2012). Invertebrates increase the degree of decomposition (SEAESTEDT and CROSSLEY, 1983; HÄTTENSCHWILER and GASSER, 2005; WALL et al., 2008; ROUFFET et al., 2010) and mineralisation (VERHOEF and BRUSAARD, 1990) and stimulate microbial respiration (HANLON and ANDERSON, 1979; KANEDA and KANEKO, 2008).

Using long-term measurements of microclimatic data and simultaneous monitoring of the epigeic part of soil macrofauna in four sites located in forest stands with different site conditions, we tested some hypotheses of the effect of weather on soil fauna via statistical methods.

Questions to be solved: (*) Is it possible to use the basic linear trend evident from the climatic data for 2007–2014 for simple determination of increase or decrease in temperature and moisture in the studied soil environment?

(*) Is there any correlation between the catch rate of epigeic macrofauna and the climatic factors?

(*) What impact do climatic factors have on the course of temperature and moisture in the soil environment in complex with other factors of the environment?

Material and methods

Study area and sites

In the northeastern part of the Czech Republic in the Moravian-Silesian Beskids (1,160 km²), permanent research areas were set up in the Smrk and Kněhyně massifs and along the Čeladenka mountain river. A specific feature of the area is the homogenous, moderately rich bedrock consisting of sandstones and slates of the external flysch and the Magura flysch. On the abnormally thick layer of weathered parent material, there are soils with a trophic range from oligo-basic (Cryptopodsols and Podzols) to eu-mesobasic soils (Cambisols, Ranker) and with a hydric range from soils without hydromorphic influence to soils permanently affected by water (Histosol). Steep slopes (14–15° on average) predominate and the whole area is under the influence of high precipitation (>1,000 mm). The climate and the soil types present strongly affect the hydrological situation of the area (the average outflow rate 20–30 m³ s⁻¹). The climate is characterised by average annual precipitation of 690–934 mm, mean annual temperature of 2.6 °C, temperature minimum in January (−6.1 °C) and maximum in July (11.7 °C), with absolute temperature minimum −30.9 °C and absolute temperature maximum 29.5 °C (Lysá hora weather station of CHMI, 1,323 m asl).

The Pěkná forest site (49°29′01.9″ N; 18°21′23.0″ E) is characterised by a two-storey forest stand, with the upper layer consisting of Norway spruce of 98 yrs and with 95% canopy closure. The understory consists of six-year-old beech (80%) and of four-year-old fir (20%). The studied area is located below a forest road on a gentle mountain ridge in the central part of the Smrk massif that reaches the maximum altitude of 1,276 m asl. The soil environment is characterised by Haplic Podzols with mor humus form, the height of the soil profile is 70 cm. The parent rock is flysch fine-grained muscovite sandstone (Table 1).

The Stolová ridge site (49°30′31.7″ N; 18°19′24.3″ E) is located on a steep mountain ridge above the Korabský stream, which continues across the territory of the Malá Stolová mountain (1,009 m asl). The forest stand consists of 88% spruce with admixed beech, larch and birch aged 89 with full canopy closure. The soil environment is characterised by Leptosols with moder humus form, with the soil profile reaching 80 cm in depth. The parent rock is flysch sandstone with 10–30% of the area covered by boulders forming a talus field (Table 1).

The Čeladenka valley site (49°29′55.2″ N; 18°20′26.1″ E) represents the alluvium of the main stream “Čeladenka”, where the vegetation consists of single-storey forest stand with spruce aged 70 yrs. The site gets flooded sporadically, after prolonged rainfall (2011). The soil is characterised by Fluvisols with moder humus form, with the soil profile reaching 80 cm in depth. The parent rock consists of alluvial sediment currently reaching up to 4 m above the water level in the stream (Table 1).

The Skalka mound site (49°31′38.5″ N; 18°23′12.9″ E) is located on an isolated conical elevation reaching 613 m asl and situated in the main valley of the mountain massif. The forest stand is formed of spruce monoculture aged 95 yrs. The soil environment is characterised by Leptosols with mor humus form, with the soil profile reaching 60 cm in depth. The parent rock is flysch quartziferous sandstone with 50–70% of the area covered by boulders forming a talus field (Table 1).

Sampling of epigeic macrofauna

Epigeic macrofauna was captured using five pitfall traps per site (4,000 ml glasses, 263 mm height, 93 mm hole diameter, covered by a tin roof, 4% solution of formaldehyde) situated in a line within each stand with 10 m spacing. After installation of the traps (1 May), the catch was monitored at six-week intervals for seven successive seasons (15 June, 31 July, 15 September and 28 October, from 2007 to 2013). On each of the dates, a mixed sample was obtained by combining specimen from all five traps on the site. The sample was preserved
in 75% ethanol. Subsequently, it was processed in a laboratory where the representatives of myriapods and isopods were determined to the species level. For the analysis of the effect of climate, total annual sums of specimen trapped at each site were used.

Seasonal activity of the myriapoda and terrestrial isopod communities was evaluated for each of the seasons studied. The diversity was expressed by the Shannon–Weaver index for individual seasonal phases (spring 1 May–15 June, summer 16 June–31 July, late summer 1 August–15 September, autumn 1 October–31 November).

### Microclimatic factors

Air temperature was measured by a PRO V2 temperature sensor placed under a shade and installed onto a shaded side of a tree trunk at the height of 2 m above ground (Fig. 1), at a distance of 20 cm from the trunk. To measure soil temperature, two sensors were used which were inserted into the centre of the monitored soil layer (Ah – horizon 1 and B – horizon 2) after exposing the soil profile. The sensors were covered with sifted soil to eliminate contact with stones (Fig. 1). The depth of the individual sensors ranged between 10 and 50 cm. The sensors (air temp., TEPH1, TEPH2) were connected to a MetoUNI datalogger where the measured values were recorded at hourly intervals.

#### Table 1. Environmental factors characterising the model sites in 2007–2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental factor</th>
<th>Pěkná forest</th>
<th>Stolová ridge</th>
<th>Čeladenka valley</th>
<th>Skala mound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temperature air °C</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp. max °C</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp. min °C</td>
<td>–21.0</td>
<td>–31.5</td>
<td>–15.9</td>
<td>–17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp. soil 1 °C</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>8.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp. soil 1_max °C</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp. soil 1_min °C</td>
<td>–1.4</td>
<td>–3.6</td>
<td>–0.4</td>
<td>–0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp. soil 2 °C</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>8.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp. soil 2_max °C</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp. soil 2_min °C</td>
<td>–2.3</td>
<td>–3.6</td>
<td>–1.6</td>
<td>–2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisture 1_max %</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisture 1_min %</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisture 2 %</td>
<td>24.74</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td>21.16</td>
<td>17.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisture 2_max %</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisture 2_min %</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of sensors HA cm</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of sensors HB cm</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altitude m</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of soil Haplic Podzols</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leptosols</td>
<td>Fluvisols</td>
<td>Leptosols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeleton %</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>Norway spruce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Technical implementation of installation of AMET weather station with air temperature, soil temperature and soil moisture measurement.

Soil moisture was determined by measuring the resistance of soil by a Virrib sensor (Amet Velké Bi-
lovice) of the weather station. One moisture sensor was located in the centre of the organomineral topsoil (Ah horizon), the other one in the centre of the subsoil layer (B horizon) (Fig. 1). The measurement allows to determine the volumetric soil moisture content in the range 5–50%. The values were recorded by the datalogger at 60 minute intervals (4/2007–10/2014). Volumetric soil moisture represents the ratio between the water content in soil and the total volume of the measured soil.

Average daily values were determined as arithmetic averages from a set of 24 measurements over the course of one day for the measured quantities (air temp., TEPH1, TEPH2, Moist1, Moist2). From a network of 30 stations, four representative areas were selected (based on integrity of measurement and site conditions).

**Data analysis**

ALA Connect software allowed download of the measured data from the weather station. Daily averages from the individual sensors were processed in Excel. Mutual correlation between the measured temperatures, soil moisture and capture rate of individual representatives of millipedes, centipedes and terrestrial isopods in pitfall traps was tested. To determine the trends in the obtained data, linear regression was used. Statistically significant similarity of the environmental data with the occurrence of macrofauna representatives was sought based on a correlation matrix.

Seasonality of the macrofauna occurrence was evaluated via one-way ANOVA based on the degree of variance. A hypothesis on the inequality of variance in individual monitored sites was expressed via STATISTICA 10.0 software. The Shannon-Weaver diversity index, calculated for each site and season separately, was used to describe the population. Due to the statistically significant variance, a multiple comparison Tukey’s HSD test of homogenous groups was performed. The result was estimation of the variability of variance in individual sites and the differentiation of groups with different values of soil moisture.

The significance of the individual environmental factors was compared via principal component analysis (PCA). The basic principle of the analysis is substitution of the original variables by a set of new (hypothetical) variables summarising variance of the original variables. The new variables are called the principal components and are a linear combination of the original variables. The principal components are determined via sequential search for the highest variability with the highest explanation of variance. The result of the PCA is a matrix of covariance coefficients with the determination of eigenvalues and the associated eigenvectors of the matrix (Haruštíaková et al., 2012). We have analysed environmental variables associated with the microclimate of the soil environment (air temp., TEPH1, TEPH2, Moist1, Moist2, exposition, altitude, ToS, Skel., aspect).

The influence of two sets of variables was tested. The matrix of independent variables of ecological data – environmental variables (air temp., TEPH1, TEPH2, Moist1, Moist2, exposition, altitude, ToS, Skel., aspect) and the matrix of dependent variables represented by species captured in pitfall traps. A canonical correspondence analysis (CCA) was applied which uses multidimensional regression to determine the linear combination of variables that best explain the inertia of the ordination scores obtained from the dependent variables (Lepš and Šmilauer, 2003). The testing of hypotheses in CCA was performed using the strength of the permutation test. The statistics were carried out in CANOCO for Windows 4.5 software which allows for the analysis of test strength using the Monte-Carlo permutation test with 999 repetitions. The test strength testing with the individual environmental variables was done using a “forward selection” function, where the first eigenvalue is compared with the appropriate statistic obtained from random permutations of the data. The result of the CCA is an ordination diagram in which the species and samples are indicated by individual points (Haruštíaková et al., 2012).

Abbreviations: Air temp., air temperature measured at 2 m above the ground; TEPH1, soil temperature in the central depth of Ah horizons; TEPH2, soil temperature in the central depth of B horizons; Moist1, volumetric soil moisture in the central depth of Ah horizons; Moist2, volumetric soil moisture in the central depth of B horizons; Exposition, exposition of the research area; Altitude, height above see level; ToS, type of soil according to WRB, 2006 (The World Reference Base for Soil Resources); Skel., percentage content of soil skeleton in the topsoil with particle size of >2 mm; Aspect, seasonal occurrence of the captured species; SW, Shannon-Weaver diversity index.

**Results**

**Climatic factors 2007–2014**

During the reporting period, the mean air temperature was 7.97 °C, the difference between the lowest and the highest situated study site being 1.4 °C. The lowest temperature (−31.5 °C) was measured at the Stolová ridge site (20 December 2009, 21:00), after previous eight days of frost with subsequent slight warming. The highest temperature (34.1 °C) was measured at the Čeladenka valley site (8 August 2013, 14:00) during 10 days of warm weather in late July/early August (Table 1). The soil temperature in topsoil (Ah horizon) did not fluctuate as widely when compared to air temperature. The mean soil temperature of 6.62–8.23 °C was 0.6–0.83 °C higher than the average air temperature.
The lowest temperature in the topsoil was measured at the Stolová ridge site along with the lowest air temperature. The highest soil temperature (22.5 °C) was determined at the Stolová ridge site (15 July 2010, 16:00). The mean soil temperature (6.74–8.61 °C) in the subsoil (B horizon) was higher by 0.12–0.38 °C when compared to the topsoil (Ah). The lowest temperature ranged between –3.6 and –1.6 °C [Pěkná forest –2.3 °C (8 March 2011), Stolová ridge –3.6 °C (23 February 2011), Čeladenka valley –1.6 °C (8 March 2011) and Skalka mound –2.4 °C (26 February 2011)]. The highest temperatures in the subsoil (B) were within the range of 19.9 and 16.6 °C.

The sites differed significantly by their maximum values of volumetric soil moisture (27.5–49.2%) from the measured average volumetric soil moisture (14.26–26.85%). The highest value was recorded at the Čeladenka valley site (49.2%, 24 June 2014). During the studied seven-year period, the mean annual air temperature increased by 2.9 °C.

**Influence of weather on soil macrofauna**

Mutual comparison allowed to calculate a correlation matrix for the individual sites to define the relationship between air temperature, soil temperature, soil moisture and the capture rate of macrofauna in pitfall traps. A correlation between air and soil temperature was confirmed (r = 0.923 to r = 0.991). With increasing temperature, soil moisture decreased. Fitting of the individual curves of weather development and capture rate of macrofauna did not reveal a statistically significant relationship to the course of temperature. Visual comparison revealed a slight similarity in the development of soil moisture and increase in the occurrence of macrofauna, but with a partial time delay after the period of increased moisture. Only at the Čeladenka valley site, there was a correlation between the captured macrofauna and air temperature (r = 0.437, Table 2) and soil temperature in the topsoil (Ah) layer (r = 0.416) and the subsoil (B) layer (r = 0.397).

**Seasonality effect**

Due to the course of weather throughout the year, when the changing temperature delineates a curve similar to a sinusoid, an influence of the seasonal aspect on the development of soil macrofauna population was found. The variance of occurrence of a species was analysed by one-way ANOVA where the hypothesis of equality of variance in mean values of the basic data-set was rejected by a test criterion (F = 6.3675 and p = 0.00051, Fig. 2). Using a Tukey’s HSD test of multiple comparisons, a statistically significant difference was detected in the Summer set. Species diversity was determined in parallel (Shannon-Weaver index) for the population captured in spring (SW = 1.853), summer (SW = 2.213), late summer (SW = 2.113) and autumn (SW = 2.156). The highest species diversity was detected in the summer season.

**The effect of environmental variables**

The determination of the effect of individual environmental variables was performed via PCA which was explained using four canonical axes. Based on the fact that axis 1 explained 79.33% of the variance in the original data matrix, we can consider only the first component. Axis 2 explained 8.72% of the variance, followed by axis 3 with 7.21% and axis 4 with 4.74% of the variance of the original data. From the values of explained variance from the correlation matrix it follows that the important components are altitude (r = 0.389) and type of soil (r = 0.304). Another significant component was soil moisture, where the moisture in the subsoil (B horizon) was more significant (r = 0.229) than in the topsoil (Ah horizon) (r = 0.1326). Soil and air temperature reached only very low values of explained variance.

In our case, the first canonical axis can be interpreted as a gradient of the site, from eastern exposition (r = 0.608) with skeleton content (r = 0.457) and slightly higher air temperature (r = 0.180) to the site with lower altitude (r = –0.579), more favourable fluvisol conditions (r = –0.518) and higher soil moisture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pěkná forest</th>
<th>Stolová ridge</th>
<th>Čeladenka valley</th>
<th>Skalka mound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>–0.0692</td>
<td>0.1906</td>
<td>0.4372</td>
<td>0.1326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp. soil 1</td>
<td>–0.0337</td>
<td>0.2791</td>
<td>0.4159</td>
<td>0.1161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp. soil 2</td>
<td>–0.0387</td>
<td>0.3244</td>
<td>0.3968</td>
<td>0.1289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisture 1</td>
<td>0.0635</td>
<td>–0.2220</td>
<td>–0.0343</td>
<td>0.0892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisture 2</td>
<td>0.0289</td>
<td>–0.1006</td>
<td>–0.2089</td>
<td>0.0663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The gradient of the second canonical axis best characterises correlations with the soil moisture ($r = 0.396$) and the type of soil ($r = 0.377$) variables. The selected environmental variables explain 22.24% of the total inertia of species data. The environmental variables which significantly influence the variability of animal communities were determined via forward selection, the most significant variables being exposition, altitude and type of soil while temperature, moisture and seasonality were of reduced significance (Table 3).

As regards the studied species of the Chilopoda group, they occur more frequently on sites with lower content of skeleton and good hydrologic regime in medium and higher positions (Fig. 3). As regards the relation to temperature, Chilopoda are more resistant to lower temperatures and do not suffer from frost. In contrast, Diplopoda occurred in medium and lower altitudes on soils with higher content of humus and higher temperatures as well as with a good hydric regime (Fig. 3). The Isopoda were more frequent on sites with southeastern exposure with soil type Leptosols and with boulders on the surface. This site was characterized by warm climate but good hydric conditions (Fig. 3).

**Discussion**

**Weather course**

Climatic factors were measured under a mature spruce stand. Therefore, the general patterns of temperature and moisture course in a forest ecosystem must

![Fig. 2. Significance of congruence of median variance of the basic set of samples expressed via the seasonal aspect factor.](image)

**Table 3. Environmental variables driving animal communities: percentages of explained variability, significance and inclusion in manual forward selection (FW). CCA ordination of log-transformed and body size-weighted data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Variability explained (%)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>FW selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td>7.471</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altitude</td>
<td>16.91</td>
<td>6.887</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of soil</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>6.254</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeleton</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>4.867</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moist 2</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>4.812</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp. air</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>2.700</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moist 1</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>2.482</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEPH2</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.974</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.960</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEPH1</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.319</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be characterised. Temperature stratification of the atmosphere in the forest stand changes throughout the day and the season. Due to the broken surface of the stand, the effect of air flow is subdued and absorption of photoactive radiation affects the temperature in the stand (Aria, 2001). Total moisture of the stand also increases due to soil moisture as well as moisture released during transpiration of plants when compared to open areas (forest-free areas) (Hayashi, 1983; Hurtalová et al., 2003). Based on the measured climatic factors, we can assert an increase of the average temperature at the local scale by up to 2.9 °C over the period of seven years, which is in accordance with the generally reported global trend of warming (Wardle et al., 2004; Templer et al., 2012). As expected, when comparing the air temperature and soil temperature in both soil horizons, a positive correlation was demonstrated, even though the amplitude in soil temperature was smaller than in air temperature. This was the case especially in winter seasons when the continuous snow layer acts as thermal insulation. Soil moisture content changed inversely proportional to the course of air temperature. Therefore, over the course of the study, an increase in average air temperature was detected, followed logically by a decrease in moisture of the soil environment. The increase in temperature led to a gradual increase in the occurrence of synanthropic species of soil macrofauna *Porcellio scaber*. *Porcellio scaber* is a species with wide ecological valence occurring in sites under anthropogenic influence (Tuf and Tufova, 2008). Simultaneously, a decreased occurrence of the species inhabiting montane and submontane areas (*Lithobius tenebrosus, Lithobius borealis*) was observed. *Lithobius tenebrosus* has been described as a species associated with trunks of coniferous trees (Schatzmann, 1990; Tajovský, 2001; Kula and Lazorič, 2014). *Lithobius borealis* is a species typical of montane and submontane spruce stands linked to tree bark (Summers and Uetz, 1979; Spelda, 1999; Blackburn et al., 2002; Kula and Lazorič, 2014).

**Effects of microclimatic factors on macrofauna**

The effects of weather on the occurrence of macrofauna communities are reported on by Auerbach (1949, 1951) and Fründ (1987). Positive relationship to moisture has been established for representatives of centipedes, millipedes and especially terrestrial isopods based on the understanding of their morphology, mainly their epicuticle structure (Lewis, 1981; Hopkin and Read, 1992; Wirkner and Pass, 2002). If the top wax layer of the epicuticle is noticeably missing (Blower, 1951; Mead-Briggs, 1956) and the breathing spiracula are not sufficiently formed, evaporation increases (Lewis,
Our results are in agreement with a number of studies which demonstrate a relationship between invertebrates and sites with increased soil moisture (ALBERT, 1983; FRUND, 1987; CLoudSLey-THOMPSON and CRAWFORD, 1970; JABIN, 2008).

For centipedes in the temperate zone, a very wide temperature valence and tolerance was reported (ALBERT, 1983). Lithobius forficatus showed activity in a temperature range between 0–32 °C (PFLEIDERER-GRUBER, 1986), and even survived frost of –3 °C for one week without any damage (LAVY and VERHOEF, 1996). Temperature tolerance is confirmed by results of laboratory breeding (JABIN, 2008), where the abundance of centipedes did not correlate with temperature data. Since no temperature threshold of activity has been defined for individual centipede species, a sum of effective temperatures could not be used. Therefore, their activity was assessed only as a sum of the numbers of their occurrences at a site in the reference growing season. The seasonal aspect was observed, which defined the summer period (June–July) as the most appropriate for the activity of centipedes, since it also features the highest rainfall. Extreme temperatures have no effect on the abundance of macroarthropods (JABIN, 2008). It was found out that millipedes (DAVID et al., 1996), isopods (TANAKA and UDAGAWA, 1993) and rove beetles (TOPP, 1978) can survive hypothermia at the temperature between –4 and –5 °C. In our study sites, soil freezing down to a depth of 12 cm was detected only in 2011 when no snow cover formed even at higher elevations. Therefore, an increased mortality in soil arthropods cannot be ruled out, since snow cover fulfills an insulating function (BALE, 1991). Certain limited level of activity of macroarthropods cannot be excluded even under the snow cover.

To demonstrate the impact of climatic factors, we used the principal component analysis (PCA), where the basic environmental factors affecting soil environment were monitored. Based on a correlation matrix with verification of the regression analysis test using the Monte-Carlo test, it was found out that the factor of the type and location of the soil environment has a more significant effect than the climatic factors. We can conclude that microclimatic factors do not have a statistically significant influence on the distribution of the individual soil macrofauna species. Exposition, altitude, type of soil and soil skeleton content, i.e. factors determining the quality of the soil were confirmed to be important factors. It follows from the data that the occurrence of species is closely related to the quality of the environment and not to the temperature or moisture. It should be stressed that the presented results are of a smaller scale i.e. represent a regional assessment. At the global scale, significantly higher abundances were found in warmer areas compared to colder areas (BLACKBURN et al., 2002).

Conclusions

A direct effect of microclimatic factors of the soil environment (temperature, moisture) on the dynamics of the communities of centipedes, millipedes and terrestrial isopods in mountain spruce forests has not been proven.

Nevertheless, an indirect effect of environmental factors, such as exposition, altitude and soil skeleton content was found. An increase in average air temperature by +2.9 °C and decrease in soil moisture by –4.49% may be a cause for the decline in montane and submontane species (Lithobius borealis, Lithobius tenebrlosus) and an increase in the numbers of synanthropes (Porcellio scaber, Ophyiulus pilosus) with wide ecological valence at the expense of relict species.
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Abstract


Land consolidation in Slovak Republic is claimed to be negatively perceived, although, there is no empirical evidence of this. This is used by administration to interfere with land consolidation. Based on owners’ opinion in cadastral area of Malý Báb, where land consolidation was carried out, we show that a positive view on land consolidation prevails (almost 80%). Groups of respondents with inclination to a negative perception (e.g. the seniors with bad experiences in the past, ignorant juniors) were identified, problematic areas (e.g. communication, mistrust, contributions to environmental measures) and lack of information (e.g. people with a lower education and juniors) highlighted. It seems that a positive attitude on land consolidation could be achieved with well-informed owners, provided their views and concerns will be respected.
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Introduction

Fragmentation, unresolved ownership relations, and environmental issues characterize situation (not only) in Slovakia, see e.g. Jusková et al. (2015). According to various sources, one of the most widespread tools for solving these problems is land consolidation. FAO (2004, 2008) defines land consolidation as a term used broadly to describe measures for adjusting property rights structure through co-ordination between owners and users. Land consolidation involves re-allocation of parcels to remove fragmentation effects but the term goes well beyond these actions. Land consolidation has been associated with broad economic and social reforms from the time of its earliest applications. Hartvigsen (2015) shows, that land consolidation is more than an outcome of normal land market transactions agreed between a few private landowners. Land consolidation is carried out through a project and connected with a certain geographical area (project area). Land consolidation outcome is the result of a planning process, facilitated by land professionals along with active involvement of landowners and other stakeholders in the project area. Reallocation plan, as a result of planning process, displays land parcels layout and connected ownership after a land consolidation project. Thomas (2006) defines land consolidation as one of the most important elements in helping to solve the structural

*Corresponding author:
e-mail: zlatica.muchova@uniag.sk
problems of agriculture and agricultural production. International consultants recommend land consolidation procedures as a “secret weapon” for economic growth and shared wealth. Generally most of the definitions present land consolidation as a tool for solving 1) land readjustment (land use, ownership and other rights) and 2) spatial physical planning (roads, landscape and soil). Recently, authors especially highlight multi-functions of land consolidation, specifically comprehensive reallocation of (rural) land while addressing environmental issues.

First projects in Slovakia were aimed only at land readjustment to eliminate land fragmentation as defined by e.g. Demetriou (2012). Over time, land consolidation in Slovakia adopted a multidisciplinary approach as defined by e.g. Lisec et al. (2014). They indicated that main aims of land consolidation are plots structure, road infrastructure improvements and that land consolidation is an important tool for agricultural and rural development. Also Jürgenson et al. (2010) consider land consolidations as tools of land management which can reduce land fragmentation and other disturbing factors of land use. Land consolidation is an excellent instrument to implement rural development projects with multiple purposes and goals, in a single land consolidation project. According to Pašakarnis et al. (2013) land consolidation can even minimize the inequality between rural and urban areas, if the improvements include agricultural production, better housing, employment, infrastructure, education, health services, environment, cultural opportunities etc.

Land consolidation means (Blažek et al., 2014; Havlíček et al., 2014; Ivanová et al., 2013; Li et al., 2014; Liga et al., 2014; Murgaš, 2009; Tarasovičová et al., 2013) introduction of land arrangement changes of a certain territory, in order to create an integrated soil management according to the needs of individual landowners, in addition to the social demands on the landscape, environmental and construction issues. Louwsma et al. (2014) emphasize land consolidation as being an improvement of distribution of agricultural plots, water management and infrastructure. To improve the structure of rural areas, land consolidation is aimed at creation of a functional and attractive rural environment, in which it is pleasant to work, live and recreate for residents and visitors alike. Land consolidation arranges land plots spatially and functionally, consolidates or splits them up to provide conditions for effective management by landowners. Besides that, it also enables environmental improvement, soil conservation, water management and increasing ecological stability (Kadlec et al., 2014; Dumbrovský et al., 2004). Land consolidation refers to a series of activities, which deal with improvement of productivity and working conditions in rural areas, production of reconstruction plans for rural settlement, and improving rural life (Long, 2014). If land consolidation is implemented in a comprehensive way, it could support environmental protection and management of natural resources. Jürgenson (2010), Olah and Boltižiar (2009), Špulero-vá et al. (2011) summarized, that land consolidation can solve land use conflicts for example in the infrastructure, nature, environment and furthermore it can cover public demands of land, sustainable land management and improve general livelihood in rural areas. Land consolidation can be used to make agriculture and forestry more competitive, can help to improve access to plots, can support environmental management and sustainable development in rural areas.

Despite their obvious benefits, land consolidations in Slovakia struggle with public recognition as a useful tool that works for individuals, communities, state, environment, improves possibilities for managing land market as well as tax collection. Thomas (2006) reminds that many people are surprised/disappointed if after finishing initial projects some of the expected gains do not materialize. Land consolidation procedures can be successfully carried out, only if decisions to take such measures are an outcome of attentive diagnosis and comprehensive analysis, with precisely-defined goals. Careful attention must be paid when using special instruments for specific structural conditions. It is agreed by many authors, that land consolidation is dependent on political, socio-economic and environmental demands of particular countries or regions.

Land consolidation projects may be justifiably criticized for a lack of feedback from potential participants (Podhražská et al., 2015), who are directly affected (with major consequences). It is possible to determine an appropriate strategy and tactic for further positive development (and public perception) of land consolidation by focusing on the views of residents and owners themselves.

Authors of this contribution aimed at collecting empirical evidence on participants’ opinion/perception of landscape consolidation and derivation of some implications. Our goal is to find the main target groups of population in terms of age, education and gender, on which it will be appropriate to focus education and promotion regarding land consolidation. Based on a survey, we try to identify the most negative attitudes and (perceived) problems that may result in rejecting the entire process. Suggestions are also discussed, how to positively influence the public for supporting full-scale implementation of comprehensive land consolidations.

Material and methods

Research of satisfaction and opinion about land consolidation was carried out in Malý Báb cadastral area, where a land consolidation project was completed (Fig. 1). Table 1 shows some details about this land consolidation project. The cadastral area is located in the western part of Slovakia.
Table 1. Basic information about land consolidation project in the case study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malý Báb</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>1. 6. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End</td>
<td>28. 12. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ownership relations</td>
<td>7,673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a better understanding of the whole land consolidation process timeline, Table 2 shows time requirements for individual stages. This project lasted for 6 years and 3 months, costing 347,289 EUR. Table 3 shows ownership parameters of the area.

Data on landscape consolidation perception was obtained by interviews using a standard questionnaire with 15 questions. Interviewers were prepared to explain any uncertainties. Questions were formulated as confirmatory (i.e. respondent either confirms – YES, or does not confirm – NO) and binary (YES/NO – 1/0). 60 questionnaires in the cadastral area of Malý Báb were collected.

Survey questions were divided into three categories:
- 1st category of questions aims at finding out if respondent had heard of land consolidations and if he/she had been an active participant in the project. If the answer is YES, interviewer asks questions from the 2nd category. If the answer is NO, interviewer asks/answers questions from the 3rd category.
- 2nd category of questions dealt with a specific information to determine positive and negative opinion of respondents about the entire process of land consolidation.

Fig. 1. Demonstration of initial ownership relations (A) compared to the new reallocation plan (B).

Table 2. Timetable for land consolidation project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision about regulation of land consolidation</td>
<td>1. 6. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geodetic grid</td>
<td>30. 7. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision of land consolidation area</td>
<td>31. 10. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planimetric mapping</td>
<td>31. 10. 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevation mapping</td>
<td>31. 10. 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land valuation</td>
<td>31. 7. 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial state registry</td>
<td>31. 7. 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local territorial system of ecological stability</td>
<td>31. 7. 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General principles for functional territorial organization</td>
<td>31. 5. 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of reallocation of new plots</td>
<td>31. 1. 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal for common and public facilities and measures</td>
<td>30. 9. 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocation plan in the form of placement and marking plan</td>
<td>30. 9. 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of land consolidation project</td>
<td>30. 4. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updating documentation on new mapping and geodetic plan</td>
<td>30. 9. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration in the Land Registry</td>
<td>28. 12. 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3rd category of questions collects parametric information: EDUCATION, AGE and GENDER. Based on this information, we attempted to find dependencies.

**Questionnaire**

QAR. Have you heard of land consolidation?
- YES [1]
- NO [0] (If the answer is NO, interviewer goes on to question Qx1R about education).

QBR. Do you perceive land consolidation as positive?
- YES [1]
- NO [0]

QCR. Have you been an active participant of land consolidation before?
- YES [1]
- NO [0]

QDR. Do you feel that land consolidation helped you with something?
- YES [1]
- NO [0]

QER. Have the procedures of land consolidation project been sufficiently explained to you?
- YES [1]
- NO [0]

QFR. Do you have now a better overview of your ownership/property than before the land consolidation project?
- YES [1]
- NO [0]

QGR. Do you know the location of your parcels now?
- YES [1]
- NO [0]

QHR. Have new parcels been discovered during the land consolidation project you were unaware of?
- YES [1]
- NO [0]

QIR. Do you have information about environmental aspects of the land consolidation project?
- YES [1]
- NO [0]

QJR. Do you agree with the contribution for common facilities and measures?
- YES [1]
- NO [0]

QKR. Do you evaluate the approach of planners and other participants (mayor, deputies, authorities, etc.) positively?
- YES [1]
- NO [0]

QLR. Based on your experience, would you agree (again) with the initiation of a project in your cadastral area?
- YES [1]
- NO [0]

Qx1R. Have you completed (technical) university (bachelor, master, engineer)?
- YES [2] (It is treated as higher education.)
- NO [1] (It is treated as secondary and lower education.)

Qx2R. Age of respondent (determined by interviewer!)
- Lower [1] (obviously junior)
- Middle [2] ("productive age")
- Higher [3] (obviously senior)

Qx3R. Gender (determined by interviewer!)
- Male [2]
- Female [1]

For the collected data evaluation, conventional methods of descriptive statistics and multivariate methods were used (cluster analysis for identification of similar groups of respondents). To study connections of responses based on parameters GENDER (1 – female, 2 – male), AGE (1 – juniors /18–24 years/, 2 – middle age /25–64 years, “productive age”, 3 – seniors /above 65 years/) and EDUCATION (1 – without higher education, 2 – higher education) analysis of contingency tables with chi-square test (p-value < 0.05) was used (http://cran.r-project.org).

**Results**

In Malý Báб cadastral area (Table 4) positive responses prevailed in questions QAR “Have you heard of land consolidation?” (90%), QBR “Do you perceive land consolidation as positive?” (77%), QDR “Do you feel that land consolidation helped you with something?” (57%), QFR “Do you have now a better overview of your ownership/property than before the land consolidation project?” (65%), QGR “Do you know the location of your parcels now?” (82%) and QLR “Based on your experience, would you agree (again) with the initiation of a project in your cadastral area?” (57%). Questions QDR (57%), QFR (65%) and QLR (57%) were answered positively, but there was a high number of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of ownership relations</th>
<th>Number of parcels</th>
<th>Average number of co-owners per parcel</th>
<th>Average number of parcel per owner</th>
<th>Average area per parcel (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before the project</td>
<td>7,673</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the project</td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Basic information about ownership before and after the land consolidation project in the case study area
negative answers. Negative answers were recorded in questions QCR “Have you been an active participant of land consolidation before?” (52%), QER “Have the procedures of land consolidation project been sufficiently explained to you?” (53%), QHR “Have new parcels been discovered during the land consolidation project you were unaware of?” (67%), QIR “Do you have information about environmental aspects of the land consolidation project?” (74%), QJR “Do you agree with the contribution for common facilities and measures?” (68%) and QKR “Do you evaluate the approach of the planner and other participants (mayor, deputies, authorities, etc.) positively?” (52%), but with a rather high number of positive answers. It can be concluded that respondents answered 50% of the questions positively and 50% of the questions negatively, an equal ratio.

Dendrogram (Fig. 2) shows similarity of responses in groups which are arranged by gender, education and age. The first number in the three-digit code means: 1 – female, 2 – male; second number: 1 – lower education, 2 – higher education; third number: 1 – junior, 2 – middle age, 3 – senior.

Splitting the tree at the height of 2.0 leaves us with two groups. The smaller one on the left consists of young females and males without higher education and older males without higher education (which are surprisingly closer to the young females than males). The large group has three prominent subgroups. Productive and senior females with higher education on the right, productive females without higher education on the left and the rest of the combinations in between.

We attempted to find answers’ dependency on gender (Table 5), education (Table 6) and age (Table 7), based on the outputs of contingency tables (chi-square with p-value < 0.05).

Statistically significant dependency on gender was found in responses to QFR “Do you have a better over-

Table 4. Summary percentages of responses to the questions asked in the survey without regard to the education, age and gender. Questions are listed in Material and methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>QAR (%)</th>
<th>QBR (%)</th>
<th>QCR (%)</th>
<th>QDR (%)</th>
<th>QER (%)</th>
<th>QFR (%)</th>
<th>QGR (%)</th>
<th>QHR (%)</th>
<th>QIR (%)</th>
<th>QJR (%)</th>
<th>QKR (%)</th>
<th>QLR (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>76.67</td>
<td>48.33</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>81.67</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>48.33</td>
<td>56.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>51.67</td>
<td>43.33</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>51.67</td>
<td>43.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Summary percentages of responses to the questions asked in the survey with regard to the gender. Questions are listed in Material and methods. Statistically significant response dependency on gender is denoted by the + sign next to the particular response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>QAR (%)</th>
<th>QBR (%)</th>
<th>QCR (%)</th>
<th>QDR (%)</th>
<th>QER (%)</th>
<th>QFR (%)</th>
<th>QGR (%)</th>
<th>QHR (%)</th>
<th>QIR (%)</th>
<th>QJR (%)</th>
<th>QKR (%)</th>
<th>QLR (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>96.55</td>
<td>79.31</td>
<td>58.62</td>
<td>62.07</td>
<td>55.17</td>
<td>79.31</td>
<td>86.21</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>31.03</td>
<td>58.62</td>
<td>58.62</td>
<td>62.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>44.83</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>58.62</td>
<td>68.97</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>37.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>83.87</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>38.71</td>
<td>51.61</td>
<td>38.71</td>
<td>51.61</td>
<td>77.42</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>38.71</td>
<td>51.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>61.29</td>
<td>48.39</td>
<td>61.29</td>
<td>48.39</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>77.42</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>61.29</td>
<td>48.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2. Dendrogram – Diana (agglomerative clustering) for all available (nonempty) gender (1 or 2); education (1 or 2); age (1, 2 or 3) groups with regard to questions A to L responses.
view of your ownership/property than before the land consolidation project?" and QJR “Do you agree with the contribution for common facilities and measures?” dependency on education in question QLR “Based on your experience, would you agree (again) with the initiation of a project in your cadastral area?” and dependency on age in questions QBR “Do you perceive land consolidation as positive?”, QKR “Do you evaluate the approach of the planner and other participants (mayor, deputies, authorities, etc.) positively?” and QLR again.

Discussion

Based on responses it can be clearly concluded that respondents are aware of the existence of land consolidation and most perceive it positively. They are also aware of irregularities and chaos in property rights because they experience (d) this phenomenon in various areas of life. They perceive naturally the fact that it would be appropriate to make some amendments. Due to lack of information, however, they cannot consider whether the proposed method of solution through the land consolidation is suitable and natural human fear of the unknown manifests itself.

After the project they are clearly better informed about the location of their parcels. Unfortunately, only at the end of the project, the participants are able to fully perceive the benefits of land consolidation. This is based on the fact that they can easily compare, without any complicated explanation, the state of their ownership before and after the project.

Contributions to the common facilities and measures are perceived negatively, since the participants of land consolidation provide “free of charge” a certain percentage of their property and they cannot (are unable to) verify whether any value and benefits will reach them.

A land consolidation project provides an additional review of existing ownership relations, which may, in certain cases, notify owners about new property. In the majority of cases, plots “lost” due to historical development have not been discovered mirroring the quality of the land evidence.

Environmental aspects were not explained sufficiently. Due to detachment from the ownership in the past, perception of a need to protect the natural environment, awareness of the aesthetic and staging potential of rural area is absent. We expect the situation to improve with a change of generations, because ecology and environment are gaining weight with time in the whole European Union. Landscape should be consolidated and maintained so as to be attractive for living, recreation, business, investment and be sustainable.

Facts and implications from our survey highlighted some groups of respondents. Well-educated respondents of “productive” age consider land consolidation as an appropriate tool for handling a large range of issues related to ownership and rural development. This result was expected. Based on the age of respondents, we can assume that most of them are owners of certain land area possibly through an inheritance, purchase or
other legal act. Farm managements are also members of this group. Their education enables them a potential management of the property for a benefit (private/business use, selling, leasing).

Alternatively, seniors (males in particular) with a lower education show a negative view of some aspects of land consolidation. We assumed the opposite. We believed that this group would have the greatest interest in land consolidation. In this group, experience prevails over knowledge. They remember the injustices that landowners suffered during forced collectivization. Based on these experiences, in many cases, they reject any manipulation of land ownership, land transfers and contribution of land for common facilities and measures. They do not fully understand the land evaluation criteria, the difference to a market price in particular.

In our opinion the key are juniors under 24 years, who expressed lack of knowledge, lack of information, insecurity and particular ignorance to the process. A small subgroup already owns the land. Some of them are economically active. Unfortunately, many of them follow the passive-consumerist lifestyle of the modern age.

If processes of land consolidations are to be successful, promotion needs to target groups that reject or don’t have any interest in land consolidation and clearly show that benefits dominate over eventual disadvantages (e.g. by visualization and “success stories”).

Using comparison of base demographics of the case study area and the Slovakia (Table 8) we can try to estimate the evolution of public perception of landscape consolidations.

Available data shows, that in Slovakia, “productive” age represents 69% of the population and higher education has 20% of the population. Let us assume that “productive” age population perceives land consolidation positively, by a vast majority, while maybe 2/3 of seniors perceive land consolidation negatively. It can be expected that the group of seniors will contain more and more educated/well-informed (“pro land consolidation”) people on the basis of natural regrouping of population in the “productive” age amongst seniors (and by interaction/communication between generations) thus shifting the perception. Positive differences between the situation before and after a land consolidation should be explained to juniors, who will eventually become the economically active population. They will gradually acquire the ownership of the land. Relevant campaigns, journals, advertising, promotional materials are available which can be aimed at specific target groups. The process can be made more attractive to them using examples of realizations that can promote their interests such as cycling, relaxation areas, playgrounds etc.

Conclusions

Efforts to obtain empirical evidence about land owners’ perception of land consolidation and analysis of collected data showed the following key findings. Awareness about land consolidation is high (90% on average), positive perception also (77%). They are considered helpful/useful in some way (57%) and seen as contributing to a better overview of ownership (65%). A majority (57%) would even agree with additional land consolidation. Among issues with a negative perception can be mentioned the contribution to the common facilities and measures (42%), a lack of information about ecological aspects (27%) and land consolidation as a whole (47%). Also the participants do not feel that new plots have been discovered that they were unaware of (33%). As essential groups, we consider respondents of higher education in “productive” age (they perceived land consolidation as a tool for consolidation of the country), seniors of lower education (much more conservative than we expected, prominent lack of trust based on bad experiences in the past is shown, by males in particular) and juniors (group with a lack of information, lack of knowledge or even ignorance). We think that addressing problematic groups of respondents/population, especially juniors, is important, so they can be educated about land consolidation. Natural demographic development should strengthen positive opinion/support for implementation of land consolidation among seniors. Information campaigns should focus on juniors, who will soon be economically active, so

Table 8. Base demographics of the case study area and the Slovak Republic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter representation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. a. Malý Báb</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18–24 years – juniors</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25–64 years</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Above 65 years – seniors</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Without education and secondary</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University education</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they can make decisions about their interests/quality of life (i.e. “not only” ownership but also “nice” country, “healthier” environment, opportunities for relaxing...). Seniors’ concerns can be mitigated by better communication with examples of successful completion of land consolidation (including common facilities and measures and environmental impact). In this way, positive pressure on the administration could be established, for greater extent of land consolidations in Slovakia. Also any proposed measures should be implemented in accordance with the needs for landscape development, ecological stability, quality of life of citizens and the following generations.
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Abstract


The aim of this article is to present research on the relationship between forest stand age and its functional effect. Forest ecosystem (forest stand) age together with its stocking and health condition is specified as criterion characterizing forest stand (with simplified structure) actual stage, dynamics and functional effect on a base of realized analysis of wide spatial and time forest stand parameters data set. The criterion “forest ecosystem development phases” is used for forest age structure expression. It represents the percentage of forest stand age from a predicated period of its existence – rotation period. There were realized development dynamics analyses of particular forest functions and actual functional effects; forest stand age weight development as a reducing criterion for different forest stand conditions and model real effect of the forest functions development for chosen stand types. Research was carried out at the state enterprise Lesy ČR, s.p., organization unit Židlochovice. The results present a synergistic effect of functional reduction criterion on the real effect of forest stand functions. Simultaneously, the higher the forest stand age, the higher the importance of the forest stand condition and stocking.
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Introduction

An increasing number of authors are concerned with the evaluation of forest functions on the base of parametric quantification at the present time. The reason is primarily the requirement of forest functions value quantification as the primary presumption of objective poly-functional forest management.

The processes and functions are not the end services directly used by people. They are only the biological, chemical and physical interactions among ecosystem units (features, attributes) (Boyd and Banzhaf, 2006; Kline, 2007). Although, e.g. Kline (2007) presents on the example of forests ecosystems that the forest utilities come from social-utility outcomes of ecosystem functions. These functions are produced by the attributes and conditions of forest landscapes. Kline’s statement (2007) is in accordance with Vyskot et al. (2003) that the forests functions are produced primarily without human interventions (Vyskot et al., 2003). Only on the basis of the functions abilities and effects quantification it is possible to define the end services for the public (Kline, 2007).

*Corresponding author:
e-mail: jiris1712@gmail.com
PHUA and MINOWA (2000) introduce the next example of ecosystem approach. The authors define the Environmental functions of the tropical forest in Kinabalu Park as biodiversity conservation and, soil and water conservation functions, including landslide, flood and drought prevention functions. Biodiversity indexes such as Fisher’s alpha index and Shannon-Wiener index, Annual Rainfall, Soil Depth, Geology, Topography and Slope are used as determination criteria.

Except for the terms “forest functions” and “ecosystem forest services”, the terms “non-timber forest products (NTFP)”, “non-wood forest products (NWFP)”, and “non-timber value (NTV)” are used in professional literature (e.g. SCARPA et al., 2000). SCARPA et al. (2000) has calculated the non-timber value (NTV) in the forests in the state of Maine (USA) using the FIA database (Forest Inventory and Analysis). According to SCARPA et al. (2000) the NTV is affected by three categories of variables: ecological attributes of the area, physical (geographical) location and socio-economic context. From the FIA database four variables were used – the stand index SITE, the distance of forests from the water element DWATR, the slope of the land SLOPE and the distance from the transport network DROADS. As a main characteristic of the forests having impact on their functional effects the species and spatial structure of the forests were set.

The forests’ functions in the ecosystem approach of VYSKOT et al. (2003, 2013) stem from the forest ecosystem existence itself. This is based on the existence of single material elements as well as energy-material flows and information flows among them and their mutual influence. This influence is present in the forest ecosystem as well as between this ecosystem and its surroundings. As an example, the influence of the forest on the micro-climate characteristics dynamics could be used, e.g. the development of the air temperature or the relative air humidity during the day in the forest is less dynamic than compared to open space (e.g. SCHNEIDER et al., 2011). Likewise, the role of protective forest belts and their spatial structure on the air flow is well known (e.g. LAMPARTOVÁ et al., 2015; BRANDLE et al., 2004; STŘEDA et al., 2007; PERI et al., 2002). The next forest function that is described by many authors, is the ability of the forest to differentiate species composition, age structure and stand structure to fix carbon (e.g. SCHNEIDER et al., 2015; MUUKKONEN, 2007; CIENCIALA et al., 2006; ZHANG, 2009 etc.). The impact of the forests on the hydrological regime and run-off conditions in the catchment area is also important. The changes of the spatial structure (extreme cases of states of calamity) of the forest have an impact on the partial components of the water balance. By this the moisture conditions or the total character of the run-off are affected (e.g. HLÁSNÝ et al. 2013, 2015).

Comprehensive overview of the forest functional effects are presented e.g. by ČABOUN et al. (2010), who in principle and systematically describe the impact of the trees and forests on single ecosystem processes. These are then aggregated into functional groups – edaphic, atmospheric, hydric, lithic, phytobiotic, zoobiotic, microbiotic and anthropic. TUTKA et al. (2009) states the example of these functions’ structuring on market and non-market. This is the step bonding the forests’ functions and ecosystem services.

The aim of the paper was to find out, if there is any influence of the forests’ age on the ability of the function production, and if so, by what way. The theoretical model according to VYSKOT et al. (2003, 2013) was verified on the development trend of the real forests.

Material and methods

Methodological basis of this work is the original method: The Quantification and Quantitative Evaluation of the Societal Forests Function (VYSKOT et al., 2003, 2013) (next only “Method”). This method claims that forest ecosystem influence to the environment is defined by its all-society functions (VYSKOT et al., 2003) – bio-production, ecological-stabilization, hydric-water management, edaphic-soil conservation, social-recreation and sanitary-hygienic. These forest functions are evaluated on two levels. The first level is called the real potential of the forests functions. This is given by the biotope parameters which present functional-determination criteria. The real potential of the forests functions represents the potential of the forest functional ability. This is the maximal reachable forest function production, which the given forest is able to reach in a given area.

The second level is given by the actual state of the forest. This is described through the functional-reduction criteria affecting the real effect of the forest functions. These criteria are set separately for structurally differentiated (rich) forests and stands with the simplified space structure.

The recent state (as well as the functional affects) of the structurally differentiated forests determine the functional-reduction criteria: a) the frequency distribution of the breast-height diameters; b) the height differentiation of the forest; c) the horizontal distribution of the wood and d) health condition.

These criteria could also be used for the forest with simplified space stand structure. The value of a-c criteria would be however, more or less constant. That is why the criteria of age, stocking and health condition are used for these types of forests. On the other hand, it is clear, that the criteria of age and stocking lose their sense of widely structured forests with very differenti-
aged age structure on the same area. Therefore, the only universally used functional-reduction criterion is the forests health condition.

Solving the steps of forest age influence to real functional effect of forest stand consists in a) quantification and evaluation of forests potential functional ability – real potential of forest functions \( (R_{P_{m}}) \), b) quantification and evaluation of forests actual functional effects – real effect of forest functions \( (R_{E_{m}}) \), c) analysis of age development influence in conditions of Forest Enterprise Zidlochovice (Forest of the Czech Republic Company).

**Function-reducing criteria determination**

Forest stand status is determined by tree species composition, stand age and spatial structure parameters and influenced by actual health disposition. Tree species composition is a direct determinant of potential functional ability of concrete forest ecosystem and is defined for the long term. It is the constant criterion for actual functional effect of the forest ecosystem evaluation.

Three suitable usable criteria for characterizing the dynamic effects of forest ecosystems were obtained by wide analysis of chronological and spatial forest stand parameters:
- Forest stand age (stand development stage)
- Stocking
- Health condition.

Their suitability and practical utility is defined by the following qualities:
- Reflect important natural processes and anthropic interventions in forest ecosystems
- Their value defines actual forest ecosystem status
- Their full value defines optimal forest ecosystem status
- Integration in legislation standards for forest stand status valuation
- Easy availability, measurability and verification.

If the value of the function-reducing criterion decreases, the effect of the forest ecosystem to fill its function decreases too – real potential of forest functions is reduced to real effect of forest functions.

Criterion “forest stand age” (forest ecosystem development stage) is used for the expression of age. The forest ecosystem development stage represents the percentage of forest stand age from a predicated period of its existence – rotation period (Table 1). The rotation period represents the frame production period of the forest management unit (rotation period limits are recommended under legislation). These parameters usage supports their utilization for forest stands with a different age of felling maturity (VYSKOT et al., 2003).

### Table 1. Function-reducing criterion of forest stand age (forest ecosystem development stage). Source VYSKOT et al., 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest ecosystem development stage</th>
<th>% of rotation period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unstocked area</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-established young plantation, regeneration</td>
<td>to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established young plantation, young growth</td>
<td>8–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small pole stage</td>
<td>16–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole stage</td>
<td>26–40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-diameter stage of smaller dimension</td>
<td>41–60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-diameter stage</td>
<td>61–80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature stands</td>
<td>80+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Functional effectiveness depending on reducing criteria

Particular function-reducing criteria specifically influence the real effects of forest functions value (recent functional effects). The actual functional effects of forest ecosystem determination on the basis of functional-reduction criteria result from current scientific knowledge and results of parameters forest stand age (Table 2), stocking and health status research. Functional effects level = real effect of forest functions value = percentage of real potential of forest functions fulfilling (VYSKOT et al., 2003).

### Function-reducing synergy criteria

With regards to mutual cohesion and dependence of ecosystem processes in the forest ecosystem it can be claimed that function-reducing criteria take effects to real effect of forest functions value synergistically. Ecosystem relations are not constant in time. They change and dynamically transform depending on forest stand status. Real effect of forest functions resulting value is influenced by significance of separated functional-reduction criteria. The significance of function-reducing criteria was determined on the base of analysis of databases and scientific results of forest stand age, stocking and health status research.

### Analysis of the real effect of forest functions development dynamics and dependence on time

Given scientific announcement presents part of the long-term research of forest stand age influence to the
real effect of forest functions on an example of stand type C5 – pure oak stand type within the forest site type 1S1 – hornbeam-oak wood on sands with Narrow-leaved meadow-grass. Forest stand age is expressed by forest ecosystem development phases (in percentage of the rotation period). Data sets present an actual functional effect trend for different health status of forest stands. Damage degree 0 characterizes normal health status (healthy forest stand), for comparison there is also shown a trend under damage degree IIIb – dead forest stand. The value of stocking is 9–10 (full stocking); the value occurring over a prevailing part of the rotation period.

The overall development of the real effect, modeled on the existing forests (chosen forests groups) comes from the data of the forest management plan. The meaning of the stand group choice is the simulation of the RE\textsubscript{fl} development of the given forest during its life cycle using real variables. The choice of the stand group of the given stand type has followed the below mentioned rules from the point of view of particular functional reduction criteria and further characteristics:

- The age reduction criterion – all the presented age stages are represented (resp. % of the rotation); the same rotation.
- The stocking reduction criterion – the chosen represented value for the given age interval.
- The health condition reduction criterion – the represented value for the given age interval is used.
- Further characteristics – the same forest type is calculated as well as the similar area and position in the forest complex.

The dynamics of the real effect development is shown in two ways. The first consists of the expression of the functional value levels. By these levels the real potential is qualified. If the real effect RE\textsubscript{fl} equals e.g. 1 it means that, under the Czech Republic conditions, the actual functional effects of the solved forest are very low. The second way is the percentage expression of RE\textsubscript{fl}. The value (%) shows to what extend the actual functional effects (RE\textsubscript{fl}) fulfill the total ability of the forest (real potential RP\textsubscript{fl}).

**Results**

Forest stand age influence to topical functional effect of forest ecosystem is presented by the example of forest stand type C5 – pure oak stand type in the forest site type 1S1 – hornbeam-oak wood on sands with Narrow-leaved meadow-grass. Real effects of forest function are valuated for all groups of all-society functions – bio-production, ecological-stabilization, hydric-water management, edaphic-soil conservation, social-recreation and sanitary-hygienic. They are expressed in percentage of real potentials of forest functions and also in value grades 0–6 (Table 3).

**Table 2. Real effects of forest functions in relation to forest stand age. Source Vyskot et al., 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest ecosystem development stages (% of rotation period)</th>
<th>Bio-production</th>
<th>Ecological-stabilization</th>
<th>Forest function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resistance</td>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8–15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61–80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development trend of real effect is shown by an example of the sanitary-hygienic function.

The trend of development of the real effect of the sanitary-hygienic function has identical behavior as the real effect of the social-recreation function. This fact confirms the mentioned functions cohesion. Thanks to higher real potential the real effects of the sanitary-hygienic function obtain higher values in value degrees.

The stand age also involves the influence of two functional-reduction criteria on the real effect of the forests. Figure 1 presents the synergistic influence with the health condition. The mutual relation of stocking and age is shown in Fig. 2. There are evidently more signifi-
Table 3. The values of real potentials of forest functions \( (R_{p}) \), functionally reducing criteria and real effects \( (R_{e}) \) for selected stand type C5 – oak monoculture (the forest site type 1S1 – hornbeam-oak wood on sands with Narrow-leaved meadow-grass, Forest Administration Valtice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotation period: 120</th>
<th>Real effect ( R_{p} )</th>
<th>Real effect ( R_{e} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(in %)</td>
<td>(reduced real potential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Stocking</td>
<td>Health condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forest function: BP, bio-production; ES, ecological-stabilization; HV, hydric-water management; EP, edaphic-soil conservation; SR, social-recreation, SH, sanitary-hygienic.

The dynamics of the real effect of the societal forest functions are presented on the example of the forests groups of the forest type C5 – oak monoculture. Real effects are expressed in percent of the real forest function potential (Fig. 3) and also a reduced potential in absolute values 0–6 (Fig. 4). From the evaluation of both charts it is evident that the complex view of actual forest functional effects’ development is convenient to use in both ways of expression. The connectors’ course in Fig. 3 involves crucially the value level of the real potential of the particular functions, e.g., with high real potential (e.g. \( R_{pSH} \) – value level \( F_{v} = 4 \)) is the real effect of young forests (in age of 30 % rotation) on the value level of 3 (average). Figure 4 indicates how quick are actual functional effects (real effect) near the potential functional availability (real potential).

**Discussion**

The individual works identify the influence of age on the partial ecosystem components and processes and their dynamics. The production ratios, expressed like growth increments, are the traditional object of the long-run forest research (e.g. Assmann, 1970). Lehtonen et al. (2004) investigate the influence of the forest age on
the biomass expansion factors (BEFs) for Scots pine, Norway spruce and birch. According to this study BEFs (biomass component/stem volume) change as a stand ages, especially in Norway spruce stands (Lehtonen et al., 2004). The influence of the age of the hydric functions was presented e.g. by Vertessy et al. (2001). They have investigated relations between stand age and catchment water balance in mountain ash forests. They measured leaf area index (LAI), sapwood area index (SAI) and various water balance components in several mountain ash stands, ranging in age between 5 and 240 years. They have demonstrated that old-growth mountain ash forests yield significantly more water than young regrowth forests of the same species because of lower evapotranspiration. They have estimated the difference in evapotranspiration for 15 and 240-year-old forests to be 460 mm per year for sites with 1,800 mm annual rainfall (Vertessy et al., 2001). Cseresnyés et al. (2006) recognized stand age influence on litter mass. They found a significant increase with age detected through the age classes of 21–40, 41–60, and 61–80 years, and then a significant decrease occurred in stands above 80 years for the needle litter. In case of branch litter, the age-dependent increase was again significant to its maximum quantity, but the decrease in old stands proved to be insignificant (Cseresnyés et al., 2006).

Their research is an example of the analysis of the influence of the forest age on the pedogenetic functions. The above mentioned works confirmed the trends of the age impact on the single forest functions. Other publications (e.g. Wang et al., 2013), confirm the forest age in not only the determining indicator but it operates in accordance with other factors like the forest type.

Conclusions

Ecosystem services have become a mainstream concept for the expression of values assigned by people to various functions of ecosystems (Bennett et al., 2015). This conception respects the principles of ecosystem functions, like the ecological provisioning base. The age of the forest is one of the detail criterion influencing the quantitative and qualitative effects and abilities of the forests to produce the ecosystem functions.

The criterion forest stand age is in affinity with the rotation period of the forest stand. It is given by the definition of criterion, when forest physical age was not ideal valuable criterion for tree species with different physiological and economical maturity. The influence of criterion forest stand age is the highest from all function-reduction criteria. It is given especially by the wide extent of criterion values. Every forest stand obtains values 0–100% of age of the rotation period in standard ecosystem conditions, but its stocking usually varies between 8 and 10, and health status is characterized as slightly damaged forest stand.

The importance of criterion stocking and health status increases for the older forest ecosystems and for the youngest forest age classes their importance is very low.

The trend of real effects of forest functions has for particular functions mostly an exponential character. Development of real effect marginal values is a very important descriptive parameter. This parameter determines the level of all society forest functions influence by the criterion forest stand age.

Comparable results obtained within forest management or forest mensuration are available especially
for bio-production forest functions. Concerning other forest functions, the influence of forest stand age on functional effectiveness is not yet investigated relevantly.

Criterion forest stand age loses importance when the forests are richly structured. This can be substituted for example by the graph of DBH (diameter breast-high) frequency.

The real functional effect of the forests with simplified spatial stand structure arising from the model is, mainly in the first half of rotation, significantly dependent on age. Its wage is for all functions between 0.8 (09)–0.6. In the second half of rotation the weight of health condition is increasing as well as stocking (Vyskot et al., 2003). The structurally differentiated forests health condition stays as the crucial functional-reduction criterion. The age (age differentiated forests) and stocking lose importance. These criteria are replaced by the spread of the thickness classes and tree stratification.
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Abstract

During two winter seasons (2013–2014 and 2014–2015), we collected insects from branches of Scotch pine trees in the Borská nížina lowland (western Slovakia) using beating method. Four hymenopteran species in the larval stage were recorded in December 2013: Diprion similis (Hartig, 1834), Gilpinia frutetorum (Fabricius, 1793), Gilpinia pallida (Klug, 1812) and Gilpinia variegata (Hartig, 1834). The occurrence of diprionid larvae in the non-growing season has not been so far reported from Central Europe and may be a result of global warming.
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Introduction
Diprionid sawflies (Symphyta: Diprionidae) are primitive Hymenoptera with holarctic distribution (Viitasaari, 2002). In Europe and North America, their larvae feed on needles of various conifers. Some species undergo an unpredictable outbreak and hence might be responsible for considerable damages in Europe (Beaudoin et al., 1994; Viitasaari, 2002). Depending on climatic conditions and altitude, diprionid sawflies may have one or two generations per year (Viitasaari, 2002). As a rule, bivoltine populations of pine feeding diprionids occur in lowlands of Central Europe. Their larvae feed preferably on the Scotch pine from May till October (Lorenz and Kraus, 1957; Pschorn-Walcher, 1982). Sawflies of the family Diprionidae endure adverse conditions (e.g. winter) in diapause, typically in the eonymph stage localized inside cocoons. These can be found on twigs and understorey or in forest litter. Neodiprion sertifer (Geoffroy, 1785) represents an exception since it overwinters as eggs on twigs. Diapause also helps synchronize reproduction and development with suitable climatic conditions (Pschorn-Walcher, 1982; Knerer, 1983; Beaudoin et al., 1994; Viitasaari, 2002).

There are only few data about overwintering larvae of phytophagous insects dwelling on branches of coniferous trees (e.g. Dvořáčková and Kulfan, 2009; Parák et al., 2015; Kulfan et al., in press).
Material and methods

The study of diprionid sawflies was carried out in Scotch pine forests of different age and structure, growing on the sandy soils in the Záhorská nížina lowland, western Slovakia (Table 1). The eight investigated study plots belong to the biotope of managed pine forests and seminative pine-oak forests. The area is warm with moderately dry climate and mild winters, whereby the average temperature in January is usually above –3 °C. The average annual temperature is 9 °C, and annual rainfall about 550 mm (Lapin et al., 2002). Study plots were visited during December 2013–March 2014 and December 2014–March 2015. Sawfly larvae were sampled monthly by beating from Scotch pine branches at heights of 1–3 m above the ground, using a beating tray with a diameter of 1 m. One sample consisted of larvae that had dropped into the beating tray from a total of 20 branches which were 1 m long each. In total, ten samples (200 branches) were taken.

The larvae were preserved in 70% ethanol and examined in the laboratory, using a stereo microscope Leica EZ4. Identification of sawfly larvae was made according to Lorenz and Kraus (1957) and Viitasaari and Varama (1987). The voucher specimens of all sawfly species detected in the present study are deposited in the collection of the first author.

Results and discussion

Twenty-three diprionid larvae were collected during the first winter season in December 2013 (Table 2). Despite the comparatively low average temperature on several sampling days in December 2013, i.e. the temperature did not rise above 0 °C, all larvae were active during most of the time (for further details, see Table 2). Over the winter season from December 2014 to March 2015 no larvae were obtained.

This unusual finding of active diprionid larvae in winter has not been yet reported from Central Europe (Lorenz and Kraus, 1957; Pschorn-Walcher, 1982; Hellrigl, 1996). According to Pschorn-Walcher (1982), a partial third generation of Diprion pini occasionally emerge in the United States, but months of its occurrence were not specified.

In our material, the recorded larvae very likely belong to the second generation that did not complete their development. It is well known that the length of the larval feeding period depends on temperature (Pschorn-Walcher, 1982; Beaudoin et al., 1994; Viitasaari, 2002). Both years 2013 and 2014 were distinctly warmer in their first half (until August) than the long-term average (Fig. 1), which might be the reason for the prolonged occurrence of larvae. During the warmer autumn 2014, larvae of the last naturally occurring seasonal wave (the autumnal larvae) could complete their development and reach the dormant eonymph stage. In contrast to the year 2014, the colder weather from September to December 2013 (Fig. 1) might have caused the prolonged development of the autumnal larvae, and hence, some of them were present on pine twigs even in December. Another possibility is that global climatic changes and thus warmer climate throughout the year enabled an extra late emergence of diprionids which larvae did not achieve the dormant eonymph. Although larvae did not complete their de-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Study plot</th>
<th>GPS coordinates</th>
<th>Altitude m a.s.l.</th>
<th>Study plot characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lakšárska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48°34'56.85''N 17°10'33.41''E</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>About 25-year old pines free growing on sand dunes that gradually reach the adjacent stand about 100-year old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nová Ves</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48°34'54.46''N 17°10'34.56''E</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>About 10-year old pines forming a dense forest stand close to a canopied stand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48°34' 51.43''N 17°10'22.78''E</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>About 25-year old pines forming a forest stand wall adjacent to a meadow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48°34'55.51''N 17°9'52.23''E</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>About 15-year old pines forming a dense, strongly canopied forest stand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studienka</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48°32' 25.65''N 17°8'29.88''E</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>About 100-year old pines forming a stand with grassy undergrowth and surrounded by a meadow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48°32'16.49''N 17°8'15.03''E</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>About 15-year old pines growing in irregular clusters with grassy undergrowth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perník</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48°23'16.57''N 17°6'10.7''E</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>About 8-year old scotch pines forming a strongly canopied forest stand without grassy undergrowth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moravský</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48°33'52.4''N 16°59' 54.1''E</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>About 10-year old pines forming a canopied forest stand wall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
velopment, they could serve as a food source for insectivorous animals in lowland Scotch pine forests during mild winters.
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