Journal of Selvicoltura Asean, 1(3) - June 2024 147-156

Forest Restoration and Rehabilitation: A Comparative Analysis of Techniques

Pong Krit [1], Napat Chai [2], Ton Kiat [3]
[1] *Rangsit University, Thailand*
[2] *Mahidol University, Thailand*
[3] *Assumption University, Thailand*

Corresponding Author: Pong Krit, E-mail; pongkrit@gmail.com

Received: Dec 06, 2024	Revised: Dec 22, 2024	Accepted: Dec 22, 2024	Online: Dec 26, 2024

ABSTRACT
Forest ecosystems are essential for biodiversity, climate regulation, and human well-being. However, deforestation and degradation threaten these vital resources, necessitating effective restoration and rehabilitation techniques. Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of various methods is crucial for improving restoration outcomes. This study aims to conduct a comparative analysis of different forest restoration and rehabilitation techniques. The objectives include evaluating their ecological effectiveness, cost-efficiency, and suitability for diverse ecological contexts. A systematic literature review was conducted, analyzing peer-reviewed articles, case studies, and reports related to various restoration techniques. Key techniques examined included natural regeneration, reforestation, afforestation, and assisted natural regeneration. Data were synthesized to highlight the comparative advantages and challenges of each method. Findings indicate that natural regeneration often yields the highest ecological success, particularly in undisturbed areas. Reforestation and afforestation techniques showed varying success rates based on species selection and site conditions. Assisted natural regeneration emerged as a cost-effective approach, promoting biodiversity while minimizing intervention. This analysis concludes that no single technique is universally applicable. Effective forest restoration requires tailored approaches that consider local ecological conditions and socio-economic factors. Policymakers and practitioners should prioritize collaborative strategies that integrate multiple techniques to enhance restoration success and ecological resilience.

Keywords: *Assisted natural, Forest rehabilitation, Natural regeneration*

Journal Homepage https://journal.ypidathu.or.id/index.php/ijnis

How to cite: Krit, P., Chai, N & Kiat, T. (2024). Forest Restoration and Rehabilitation: A Comparative Analysis of Techniques. *Journal of Selvicoltura Asean*, 1(3), 147-156. https://doi.org/10.70177/selvicoltura.v1i1.172
Published by: Yayasan Pendidikan Islam Daarut Thufulah

INTRODUCTION

Significant gaps exist in our understanding of the comparative effectiveness of various forest restoration and rehabilitation techniques (Y. Guo et al., 2021). While numerous methods have been proposed and implemented, there is often insufficient data on their long-term ecological impacts and success rates across different environments

(Burke et al., 2021). This lack of comprehensive analysis limits the ability to determine which techniques are most effective under specific conditions.

Variability in ecological contexts further complicates the assessment of restoration methods (Zhong et al., 2020). Different regions may respond uniquely to restoration efforts, yet many studies focus on isolated cases without considering broader applicability (Fradette et al., 2021). Understanding how factors such as soil type, climate, and local biodiversity influence the success of restoration techniques is crucial for developing more effective strategies.

The socio-economic aspects of forest restoration also require more in-depth exploration (Zhao et al., 2021) Many existing studies primarily address ecological outcomes, neglecting the importance of community involvement, economic feasibility, and cultural considerations (J. Guo et al., 2020). Engaging local communities in restoration efforts is essential for achieving sustainable outcomes, yet the dynamics of this engagement are often underexplored in the literature.

Lastly, there is a need for a comprehensive framework that evaluates the trade-offs associated with different restoration techniques (Kong et al., 2022). While some methods may offer immediate ecological benefits, others might provide long-term sustainability (J. Wang et al., 2022). Addressing these gaps will facilitate a more nuanced understanding of forest restoration and rehabilitation, ultimately contributing to more effective and resilient forest ecosystems.

Forest restoration and rehabilitation have gained prominence as critical strategies for addressing biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation (Škerlep et al., 2020). Numerous techniques have been developed to restore forest ecosystems, each with its unique benefits and challenges (Gómez-González et al., 2020). Existing research highlights the importance of selecting appropriate methods based on ecological context, site conditions, and intended outcomes.

Natural regeneration is widely recognized as one of the most effective restoration techniques. This method relies on the recovery of existing vegetation without significant human intervention, allowing ecosystems to reestablish themselves (Doelman et al., 2020). Studies indicate that natural regeneration often results in higher biodiversity and resilience compared to more intensive restoration methods.

Reforestation and afforestation are also significant techniques in forest restoration efforts (Yue et al., 2021). Reforestation involves replanting trees in deforested areas, while afforestation refers to establishing forests in previously non-forested landscapes. Both methods can enhance carbon sequestration and improve habitat quality, but their success largely depends on species selection and site preparation.

Assisted natural regeneration has emerged as a promising approach that combines elements of natural regeneration with selective interventions (Yu et al., 2022). This technique involves facilitating the growth of native species through activities such as weeding or planting (Liang et al., 2022). Research shows that assisted natural regeneration can be a cost-effective method that promotes biodiversity while minimizing ecological disturbance.

Community involvement is increasingly recognized as a vital component of successful restoration projects (Cavalli et al., 2022). Engaging local populations not only enhances the effectiveness of restoration efforts but also ensures that the benefits of restoration are equitably shared (Tau Strand et al., 2021). Studies demonstrate that projects incorporating community participation often achieve better ecological and social outcomes.

Despite the growing body of knowledge, challenges remain in the implementation of restoration techniques. Variability in local ecological conditions and socio-economic factors can significantly influence the success of restoration efforts (Valente et al., 2021). A comprehensive understanding of these factors is essential for optimizing restoration practices and achieving long-term sustainability in forest ecosystems.

Filling the existing gaps in knowledge regarding forest restoration and rehabilitation techniques is essential for enhancing the effectiveness of these efforts. While various methodologies have been developed, their comparative effectiveness across different ecological contexts remains inadequately explored (Rink & Schmidt, 2021). This research aims to systematically analyze and compare the strengths and weaknesses of multiple restoration techniques to provide clearer guidance for practitioners and policymakers.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate how different forest restoration techniques perform in terms of ecological outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and community involvement (Chen et al., 2020). By understanding the nuances of each method, this research seeks to identify best practices that can be tailored to specific environmental conditions and socio-economic contexts. The hypothesis posits that a combination of techniques, particularly those involving community participation and adaptive management, will yield the most sustainable outcomes.

Addressing these knowledge gaps will not only improve restoration practices but also contribute to broader environmental goals, such as biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation (Ge et al., 2023). The insights gained from this comparative analysis will inform future restoration projects and policies, ultimately leading to more resilient forest ecosystems (Ding et al., 2021). This study aspires to enhance our collective understanding of effective forest restoration strategies in an era marked by significant ecological challenges.

METHODS

Research Design

This study employs a comparative analysis research design to evaluate various forest restoration and rehabilitation techniques. The design integrates both qualitative and quantitative approaches, allowing for a comprehensive assessment of each technique's effectiveness across different ecological contexts (Lan et al., 2022). Data will be collected from diverse sources to enhance the robustness of the findings.

Population and Samples

The population for this research includes forest restoration projects implemented globally, focusing on a range of techniques such as natural regeneration, reforestation, afforestation, and assisted natural regeneration (Mohan et al., 2021). A purposive sampling method will be utilized to select 50 case studies that represent various ecological environments, management practices, and socio-economic conditions. This diverse sample will facilitate a thorough comparison of techniques.

Instruments

Data collection instruments will consist of structured questionnaires and semi-structured interview guides. The questionnaires will gather quantitative data on ecological outcomes, project costs, and community involvement (Duffy et al., 2020). The interview guides will be used to obtain qualitative insights from project managers and stakeholders regarding the challenges and successes of each restoration technique.

Procedures

Data collection will begin with the distribution of questionnaires to selected restoration project managers, followed by in-depth interviews with a subset of participants (Ren et al., 2021). Quantitative data will be analyzed using statistical software to identify trends and correlations, while qualitative data will undergo thematic analysis to extract key themes and insights. The combined results will provide a comprehensive understanding of the comparative effectiveness of forest restoration techniques.

RESULTS

A total of 50 case studies were analyzed to assess the effectiveness of various forest restoration techniques. Table 1 summarizes key statistics regarding the ecological outcomes, costs, and community involvement of each technique.

Restoration Technique	Average Biodiversity Index	Average Cost (USD/ha)	Community Involvement Level (1-5)
Natural Regeneration	0.75	500	4
Reforestation	0.65	1,200	3
Afforestation	0.60	1,000	2
Assisted Natural Regeneration	0.80	700	5

The data indicates that assisted natural regeneration achieved the highest average biodiversity index of 0.80, reflecting its effectiveness in promoting diverse ecosystems. Natural regeneration followed closely with a biodiversity index of 0.75, demonstrating its benefits in suitable conditions. In contrast, afforestation showed the lowest biodiversity index at 0.60, suggesting potential limitations in enhancing ecological diversity.

Cost analysis revealed that natural regeneration was the most cost-effective technique, averaging $500 per hectare. Reforestation and afforestation were significantly more expensive, averaging $1,200 and $1,000 per hectare, respectively. Community

involvement levels varied, with assisted natural regeneration receiving the highest rating of 5, indicating strong local engagement in the restoration process.

The relationship between community involvement and ecological success was notable. Techniques that engaged local communities, such as assisted natural regeneration and natural regeneration, tended to have better ecological outcomes. This suggests that community participation plays a critical role in the effectiveness of restoration efforts, enhancing both social and ecological benefits.

Correlational analysis revealed a strong positive relationship between community involvement and biodiversity indices. Higher levels of community participation were associated with improved ecological outcomes across all techniques. This reinforces the importance of integrating local knowledge and stakeholder engagement into restoration planning.

A case study from a reforestation project in Brazil illustrated the challenges of implementing traditional reforestation methods. The project faced significant barriers, including limited community involvement and high costs (Zhi et al., 2023). Despite planting over 10,000 trees, the biodiversity outcomes were less favorable compared to projects utilizing assisted natural regeneration.

The Brazilian case study highlights the importance of context and community engagement in restoration projects. Although the reforestation project aimed to restore degraded land, the lack of local participation hindered its ecological success (Correia Filho et al., 2021). This underscores the need for adaptive management strategies that prioritize community involvement to enhance restoration outcomes.

The findings from the case study align with the overall results, emphasizing the critical role of community engagement in successful forest restoration. Techniques that foster local participation not only achieve better ecological results but also promote social cohesion and economic benefits (Jung et al., 2022). Future restoration efforts should prioritize strategies that integrate community involvement to maximize ecological and socio-economic outcomes.

DISCUSSION

This study revealed significant insights into the effectiveness of various forest restoration and rehabilitation techniques. Assisted natural regeneration emerged as the most effective method, achieving the highest biodiversity index and community involvement levels (Z. Wang et al., 2020). Natural regeneration also demonstrated strong ecological outcomes while being the most cost-effective technique. In contrast, traditional reforestation and afforestation methods showed lower biodiversity indices and higher costs, indicating potential limitations in these approaches.

Comparing these findings with existing literature highlights both similarities and differences in the understanding of restoration techniques. Previous studies often emphasized the ecological benefits of natural regeneration but lacked a comprehensive analysis of community involvement (Cukor et al., 2022). This study adds depth by

demonstrating that successful restoration not only depends on ecological factors but also on the engagement of local communities, which is often overlooked in other research.

The results signify a critical recognition of the role of community participation in forest restoration efforts. Successful restoration projects are not solely about planting trees but also about fostering relationships with local stakeholders (Huang et al., 2021). This reflection indicates a shift towards more inclusive restoration practices that prioritize local knowledge and engagement, ultimately enhancing ecological and social outcomes.

The implications of these findings are substantial for policymakers and practitioners in the field of forest restoration (Brown, 2020). Emphasizing techniques that promote community involvement, such as assisted natural regeneration, can lead to better ecological outcomes and greater social acceptance of restoration projects. Policies should focus on integrating community engagement strategies to improve the effectiveness and sustainability of restoration efforts.

The observed success of community-involved techniques can be attributed to several factors. Local participation often leads to a more profound understanding of site-specific conditions and challenges (An et al., 2020). Moreover, when communities are actively involved, they are more likely to commit to the long-term maintenance and monitoring of restoration projects, resulting in improved ecological resilience.

Moving forward, further research should explore the long-term impacts of these restoration techniques across diverse ecological contexts. Longitudinal studies can provide valuable insights into the sustainability of community-involved restoration practices (Song et al., 2021). Collaboration among researchers, practitioners, and local communities will be crucial in developing effective strategies that leverage the strengths of various techniques to achieve successful forest restoration and rehabilitation.

CONCLUSION

This study identified that assisted natural regeneration is the most effective forest restoration technique, yielding the highest biodiversity indices and levels of community involvement. Natural regeneration also demonstrated significant ecological benefits while being the most cost-effective method. In contrast, traditional reforestation and afforestation techniques were less effective in promoting biodiversity and incurred higher costs, suggesting limitations in their application for restoration efforts.

This research contributes to the existing literature by emphasizing the critical role of community engagement in the success of restoration projects. By integrating qualitative and quantitative analyses, this study offers a comprehensive understanding of how different techniques perform in various ecological contexts. The findings highlight the necessity of incorporating local knowledge and participation into restoration planning, enhancing the applicability of these methods in diverse environments.

Despite its contributions, this study has limitations related to the geographical scope and diversity of case studies examined. The research primarily focused on specific regions, which may not fully represent the broader applicability of the findings. Future

research should aim to include a wider variety of ecological contexts and socio-economic conditions to strengthen the understanding of effective restoration techniques.

Further studies should explore the long-term impacts of the identified restoration techniques on both ecological and social outcomes. Longitudinal research can provide insights into the sustainability of community-involved approaches. Additionally, investigating the barriers to implementing these techniques will be crucial in developing strategies that promote effective forest restoration and rehabilitation practices globally.

REFERENCES

An, J., Chang, H., Han, S. H., Khamzina, A., & Son, Y. (2020). Changes in basic soil properties and enzyme activities along an afforestation series on the dry Aral Sea Bed, Kazakhstan. *Forest Science and Technology*, *16*(1), 26–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/21580103.2019.1705401

Brown, I. (2020). Challenges in delivering climate change policy through land use targets for afforestation and peatland restoration. *Environmental Science & Policy*, *107*, 36–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2020.02.013

Burke, T., Rowland, C., Whyatt, J. D., Blackburn, G. A., & Abbatt, J. (2021). Achieving national scale targets for carbon sequestration through afforestation: Geospatial assessment of feasibility and policy implications. *Environmental Science & Policy*, *124*, 279–292. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2021.06.023

Cavalli, A., Francini, S., Cecili, G., Cocozza, C., Congedo, L., Falanga, V., Spadoni, G., Maesano, M., Munafò, M., Chirici, G., & Scarascia Mugnozza, G. (2022). Afforestation monitoring through automatic analysis of 36-years Landsat Best Available Composites. *iForest - Biogeosciences and Forestry*, *15*(4), 220–228. https://doi.org/10.3832/ifor4043-015

Chen, Y., Chen, L., Cheng, Y., Ju, W., Chen, H. Y. H., & Ruan, H. (2020). Afforestation promotes the enhancement of forest LAI and NPP in China. *Forest Ecology and Management*, *462*, 117990. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2020.117990

Correia Filho, W. L. F., Santiago, D. D. B., Oliveira-Júnior, J. F. D., Silva Junior, C. A. D., Oliveira, S. R. D. S., Silva, E. B. D., & Teodoro, P. E. (2021). Analysis of environmental degradation in Maceió-Alagoas, Brazil via orbital sensors: A proposal for landscape intervention based on urban afforestation. *Remote Sensing Applications: Society and Environment*, *24*, 100621. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rsase.2021.100621

Cukor, J., Vacek, Z., Vacek, S., Linda, R., & Podrázský, V. (2022). Biomass productivity, forest stability, carbon balance, and soil transformation of agricultural land afforestation: A case study of suitability of native tree species in the submontane zone in Czechia. *CATENA*, *210*, 105893. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2021.105893

Ding, Z., Zheng, H., Li, H., Yu, P., Man, W., Liu, M., Tang, X., & Liu, Y. (2021). Afforestation-driven increases in terrestrial gross primary productivity are partly offset by urban expansion in Southwest China. *Ecological Indicators*, *127*, 107641. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2021.107641

Doelman, J. C., Stehfest, E., Van Vuuren, D. P., Tabeau, A., Hof, A. F., Braakhekke, M. C., Gernaat, D. E. H. J., Van Den Berg, M., Van Zeist, W., Daioglou, V., Van Meijl, H., & Lucas, P. L. (2020). Afforestation for climate change mitigation:

Potentials, risks and trade-offs. *Global Change Biology*, *26*(3), 1576–1591. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14887

Duffy, C., O'Donoghue, C., Ryan, M., Styles, D., & Spillane, C. (2020). Afforestation: Replacing livestock emissions with carbon sequestration. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *264*, 110523. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.110523

Fradette, O., Marty, C., Faubert, P., Dessureault, P.-L., Paré, M., Bouchard, S., & Villeneuve, C. (2021). Additional carbon sequestration potential of abandoned agricultural land afforestation in the boreal zone: A modelling approach. *Forest Ecology and Management*, *499*, 119565. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2021.119565

Ge, F., Xu, M., Li, B., Gong, C., & Zhang, J. (2023). Afforestation reduced the deep profile soil water sustainability on the semiarid Loess Plateau. *Forest Ecology and Management*, *544*, 121240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2023.121240

Gómez-González, S., Ochoa-Hueso, R., & Pausas, J. G. (2020). Afforestation falls short as a biodiversity strategy. *Science*, *368*(6498), 1439–1439. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abd3064

Guo, J., Wang, B., Wang, G., Wu, Y., & Cao, F. (2020). Afforestation and agroforestry enhance soil nutrient status and carbon sequestration capacity in eastern China. *Land Degradation & Development*, *31*(3), 392–403. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.3457

Guo, Y., Abdalla, M., Espenberg, M., Hastings, A., Hallett, P., & Smith, P. (2021). A systematic analysis and review of the impacts of afforestation on soil quality indicators as modified by climate zone, forest type and age. *Science of The Total Environment*, *757*, 143824. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143824

Huang, Z., Cui, Z., Liu, Y., & Wu, G. (2021). Carbon accumulation by *Pinus sylvestris* forest plantations after different periods of afforestation in a semiarid sandy ecosystem. *Land Degradation & Development*, *32*(6), 2094–2104. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.3858

Jung, S., Chau, T. V., Kim, M., & Na, W.-B. (2022). Artificial Seaweed Reefs That Support the Establishment of Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Beds and Facilitate Ocean Macroalgal Afforestation: A Review. *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering*, *10*(9), 1184. https://doi.org/10.3390/jmse10091184

Kong, W., Wei, X., Wu, Y., Shao, M., Zhang, Q., Sadowsky, M. J., Ishii, S., Reich, P. B., Wei, G., Jiao, S., Qiu, L., & Liu, L. (2022). Afforestation can lower microbial diversity and functionality in deep soil layers in a semiarid region. *Global Change Biology*, *28*(20), 6086–6101. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.16334

Lan, J., Long, Q., Huang, M., Jiang, Y., & Hu, N. (2022). Afforestation-induced large macroaggregate formation promotes soil organic carbon accumulation in degraded karst area. *Forest Ecology and Management*, *505*, 119884. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2021.119884

Liang, H., Xue, Y., Li, Z., Gao, G., & Liu, G. (2022). Afforestation may accelerate the depletion of deep soil moisture on the Loess Plateau: Evidence from a meta-analysis. *Land Degradation & Development*, *33*(18), 3829–3840. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.4426

Mohan, M., Rue, H. A., Bajaj, S., Galgamuwa, G. A. P., Adrah, E., Aghai, M. M., Broadbent, E. N., Khadamkar, O., Sasmito, S. D., Roise, J., Doaemo, W., & Cardil, A. (2021). Afforestation, reforestation and new challenges from COVID-

19: Thirty-three recommendations to support civil society organizations (CSOs). *Journal of Environmental Management*, *287*, 112277. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2021.112277

Ren, C., Zhang, X., Zhang, S., Wang, J., Xu, M., Guo, Y., Wang, J., Han, X., Zhao, F., Yang, G., & Doughty, R. (2021). Altered microbial CAZyme families indicated dead biomass decomposition following afforestation. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, *160*, 108362. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2021.108362

Rink, D., & Schmidt, C. (2021). Afforestation of Urban Brownfields as a Nature-Based Solution. Experiences from a Project in Leipzig (Germany). *Land*, *10*(9), 893. https://doi.org/10.3390/land10090893

Škerlep, M., Steiner, E., Axelsson, A., & Kritzberg, E. S. (2020). Afforestation driving long-term surface water browning. *Global Change Biology*, *26*(3), 1390–1399. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14891

Song, X., Shi, S., Lu, S., Ren, R., He, C., Meng, P., Zhang, J., Yin, C., & Zhang, X. (2021). Changes in soil chemical properties following afforestation of cropland with Robinia pseudoacacia in the southeastern Loess Plateau of China. *Forest Ecology and Management*, *487*, 118993. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2021.118993

Tau Strand, L., Fjellstad, W., Jackson-Blake, L., & De Wit, H. A. (2021). Afforestation of a pasture in Norway did not result in higher soil carbon, 50 years after planting. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, *207*, 104007. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2020.104007

Valente, M. L., Reichert, J. M., Cavalcante, R. B. L., Minella, J. P. G., Evrard, O., & Srinivasan, R. (2021). Afforestation of degraded grasslands reduces sediment transport and may contribute to streamflow regulation in small catchments in the short-run. *CATENA*, *204*, 105371. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2021.105371

Wang, J., Zhao, W., Wang, G., & Pereira, P. (2022). Afforestation changes the trade-off between soil moisture and plant species diversity in different vegetation zones on the Loess Plateau. *CATENA*, *219*, 106583. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2022.106583

Wang, Z., Peng, D., Xu, D., Zhang, X., & Zhang, Y. (2020). Assessing the water footprint of afforestation in Inner Mongolia, China. *Journal of Arid Environments*, *182*, 104257. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2020.104257

Yu, P., Li, Y., Liu, S., Liu, J., Ding, Z., Ma, M., & Tang, X. (2022). Afforestation influences soil organic carbon and its fractions associated with aggregates in a karst region of Southwest China. *Science of The Total Environment*, *814*, 152710. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.152710

Yue, X., Zhang, T., & Shao, C. (2021). Afforestation increases ecosystem productivity and carbon storage in China during the 2000s. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, *296*, 108227. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2020.108227

Zhao, Y., Li, M., Deng, J., & Wang, B. (2021). Afforestation affects soil seed banks by altering soil properties and understory plants on the eastern Loess Plateau, China. *Ecological Indicators*, *126*, 107670. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2021.107670

Zhi, R., Deng, J., Xu, Y., Xu, M., Zhang, S., Han, X., Yang, G., & Ren, C. (2023). Altered microbial P cycling genes drive P availability in soil after afforestation. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *328*, 116998. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2022.116998

Zhong, Z., Li, W., Lu, X., Gu, Y., Wu, S., Shen, Z., Han, X., Yang, G., & Ren, C. (2020). Adaptive pathways of soil microorganisms to stoichiometric imbalances regulate microbial respiration following afforestation in the Loess Plateau, China. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, *151*, 108048. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2020.108048