

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**Tillage effects on soil aggregation and soil organic carbon profile  
distribution under Mediterranean semiarid conditions**

**Plaza-Bonilla, D.<sup>1\*</sup>, Cantero-Martínez, C.<sup>1</sup>, Álvaro-Fuentes, J.<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Departament de Producció Vegetal i Ciència Forestal, Universitat de Lleida–IRTA,  
Rovira Roure 191, 25198 Lleida, Spain. <sup>2</sup>Natural Resource Ecology Laboratory,  
Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA.

\*Corresponding author: [daniel.plaza@pvcf.udl.cat](mailto:daniel.plaza@pvcf.udl.cat)

1 **ABSTRACT**

2

3 In rainfed semiarid agroecosystems, soil organic carbon (SOC) may increase with the  
4 adoption of alternative tillage systems (e.g. no-tillage, NT). This study evaluated the  
5 effect of two tillage systems (CT, conventional tillage vs. NT) on total SOC content,  
6 SOC concentration, water stable aggregate-size distribution and aggregate carbon  
7 concentration from 0 to 40 cm soil depth. Three tillage experiments were chosen, all  
8 located in northeast Spain and using contrasting tillage types but with different lengths  
9 of time since their establishment (20, 17, and 1-yr). In the two fields with mouldboard  
10 ploughing as CT, NT sequestered more SOC in the 0-5 cm layer compared to CT.  
11 However, despite there being no significant differences, SOC tended to accumulate  
12 under CT compared to NT in the 20-30 and 30-40 cm depths in the AG-17 field with  
13 25% - 50% higher SOC content in CT compared to NT. Greater amounts of large and  
14 small macroaggregates under NT compared to CT were measured at 0-5 cm depth in  
15 AG-17 and at 5-10 cm in both AG-1 and AG-17. Differences in macroaggregate C  
16 concentration between tillage treatments were only found in the AG-17 field at the soil  
17 surface with 19.5 and 11.6 g C/kg macroaggregates in NT and CT, respectively. After  
18 17 years of experiment, CT with mouldboard ploughing resulted in a greater total SOC  
19 concentration and macroaggregate C concentration below 20 cm depth, but similar  
20 macroaggregate content compared to NT. This study emphasizes the need for adopting  
21 whole-soil profile approaches when studying the suitability of NT vs. CT for SOC  
22 sequestration and CO<sub>2</sub> offsetting.

23

24 Keywords: Mediterranean conditions, Soil aggregation, Soil organic carbon, Tillage

25

26

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2 Soil organic carbon (SOC) sequestration has been defined as any persistent net increase  
3 in soil organic C storage (Paustian *et al.*, 1997; Lal, 2004). In agricultural soils,  
4 increases in SOC can lead to both improvement in plant productivity due to greater soil  
5 fertility and ancillary benefits, such as removal of CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere (Paustian *et*  
6 *al.*, 1998). The impact of agricultural management practices on C sequestration has been  
7 widely studied (Follett, 2001; Smith, 2004) and research has focused on a better  
8 comprehension of the mechanisms involved in soil organic matter (SOM) stabilization  
9 of soils (Six *et al.*, 2002; Krull *et al.*, 2003).

10 SOM dynamics are linked with soil aggregate formation and stabilization (Balesdent *et*  
11 *al.*, 2000) and are strongly affected by agricultural management treatments (Six *et al.*,  
12 2002). Tillage not only favours SOM decomposition by aggregate breakdown but also  
13 accelerates SOM decomposition by soil microclimate change, crop residue  
14 incorporation and greater soil aeration (Balesdent *et al.*, 2000; Peterson *et al.*, 1998).  
15 Increased tillage intensity is related to the SOM declining (Rasmussen *et al.*, 1998). Soil  
16 aggregation is the process by which aggregates of different sizes are joined and held  
17 together by different organic and inorganic materials (Amézqueta, 1999). Soil  
18 aggregation is controlled by SOC, biota, ionic bridging, clay and silt content, and the  
19 presence of carbonates and gypsum (Amézqueta, 1999; Bronick & Lal, 2005). Several  
20 models of soil aggregation have been proposed (Tisdall & Oades, 1982; Six *et al.*, 1999;  
21 Goss & Kay, 2005). The latter authors developed a conceptual model of macroaggregate  
22 formation and SOC stabilization in relation to tillage. In this model, slower aggregate  
23 turnover under NT compared with CT leads to microaggregate formation within  
24 macroaggregates and SOC stabilization as a result of occlusion within these  
25 microaggregates. Consequently, the formation of soil aggregates results in the physical

1 protection of SOM from decomposer organisms and, thus, the disruption of soil  
2 macroaggregates (>250  $\mu\text{m}$ ) by tillage is followed by an increase of soil  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions  
3 (Álvaro-Fuentes *et al.*, 2008a).

4 In the semiarid agroecosystems of Spain, variable and small amounts of rainfall result in  
5 low crop yields (Cantero-Martínez *et al.*, 2007). In these agroecosystems, traditional  
6 management practices have included intensive soil tillage with mouldboard ploughing  
7 and deep subsoiling. The adoption of reduced tillage systems could be an option to  
8 increase SOC sequestration. In the same region, Álvaro-Fuentes *et al.* (2009), found  
9 greater total SOC and greater formation of stable macroaggregates under NT compared  
10 to CT at the soil surface. However, this study did not measure the whole soil profile  
11 depth. The depth of sampling is a key issue when differences in SOC levels between  
12 tillage systems are being assessed (Angers & Eriksen-Hamel, 2008). However, most of  
13 the literature on SOM protection by soil aggregates has been based on studies of the  
14 first 20 cm soil depth (e.g. Six *et al.*, 1999; Zibilske *et al.*, 2007; Beare *et al.*, 1994).  
15 Surface sampling may lead to overestimation of SOC contents in NT when compared to  
16 CT due to SOC accumulation deeper in the profile of tilled soil (Baker *et al.*, 2007).  
17 Thus, Balesdent *et al.*, (2000) recommended that the C storage comparisons take into  
18 account the first 35 cm of the soil profile due to the SOM translocation to layers deeper  
19 than the deepest ploughing event, specifically for mouldboard plough treatments. As  
20 recently reported by Angers & Eriksen-Hamel (2008), SOC storage below the soil  
21 surface under CT compared to NT may have significant implications in the role of  
22 agricultural soils as sinks for atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  mitigation.

23 The objective of this work was to study the impact of tillage on the distribution of SOC  
24 and water-stable aggregate size classes in the soil profile in three tillage experiments  
25 with contrasting CT implementation and number of years since the start of the

1 experiment. Given the limited information currently available, our main aim was to  
2 investigate the processes of SOM stabilization by aggregates with depth in the soil. We  
3 hypothesized that: i) the adoption of NT will increase SOC primarily in the soil surface;  
4 ii) CT will have greater SOC at lower depths in the soil profile compared to NT; iii) the  
5 greater SOC content in both NT at the surface and CT at depth will increase  
6 macroaggregate formation and C occlusion in the macroaggregates in these layers.

7

8

# 1 MATERIALS AND METHODS

## 2 Experimental sites

3 The study was carried out in three experimental fields located at two sites along the  
4 semiarid Ebro river valley, NE Spain. The sites were: Selvanera (SV-20) where an  
5 experimental field was established 20 years ago to compare various tillage systems; and  
6 Agramunt with two experimental fields (AG-1 and AG-17) established 1 and 17 years  
7 ago, respectively, also to compare tillage systems. General soil characteristics of the  
8 experimental fields are given in Table 1. In all the field experiments the cropping  
9 system was based on growing the winter wheat and barley in alternate years. In AG-1,  
10 barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) was grown in the first year. In all the fields, CT and NT  
11 were compared. Tillage systems were implemented according to the traditional systems  
12 of the area. In SV-20, the CT treatment consisted of one pass of a subsoiler to the 40 cm  
13 depth in August followed by chisel ploughing to 15 cm depth. In AG-17 and AG-1, CT  
14 consisted of mouldboard ploughing to 30 cm depth immediately followed by one or two  
15 passes with a cultivator to 15 cm depth both in September. The NT treatment was in the  
16 same at all the three sites, consisting of a total herbicide application (1.5 L 36%  
17 glyphosate per hectare) for controlling weeds before sowing. Planting was performed  
18 with a direct drilling disk planter set to 2-4 cm depth in November. The historical tillage  
19 management of these three fields prior to the set up of the experiments was based on  
20 intensive tillage with two-three passes of a hoe cultivator to 30 cm depth. At all sites,  
21 tillage treatments were arranged in a randomized complete block design with three  
22 replicates in SV-20 and AG-1 and four replicates in AG-17. Plot size was (50 x 7) m at  
23 SV-20, (50 x 9) m at AG-17 and (48 x 6) m at AG-1.

24

## 25 Soil sampling and analyses

1 Soils were sampled in July 2007, directly after crop harvest. There was no rainfall  
2 during the sampling period. Soil samples were obtained using a flat spade, from five  
3 soil layers from 0 to 40 cm depth (0-5, 5-10, 10-20, 20-30 and 30-40 cm). In each plot,  
4 two areas were identified 20 m apart. In each area, a composite sample was collected  
5 from three samples randomly selected. The samples were stored in crush-resistant  
6 airtight containers and, once in the laboratory, air-dried at room temperature. At the  
7 same time, two soil cores were taken per plot and soil depth for soil dry bulk density  
8 determination (Grossman and Reinsch, 2002).

9 Aggregate size separation was carried out on each composite sample using a modified  
10 wet sieving method adapted from Elliott (1986). Briefly, 100 g air-dried (8 mm sieved)  
11 soil sample was placed on the top of a 2000  $\mu\text{m}$  sieve and submerged for 5 min in  
12 deionized water at room temperature. Sieving was done manually, 50 times in 2 min to  
13 achieve aggregate separation. A series of three sieves (2000, 250 and 53  $\mu\text{m}$ ) was used  
14 to obtain four aggregate fractions: (i) large macroaggregates (2 – 8 mm), (ii) small  
15 macroaggregates (0.250 – 2 mm), (iii) microaggregates (0.050 – 0.250 mm) and (iv)  
16 silt-plus clay-sized particles (< 0.053 mm). All aggregate fractions were oven-dried at  
17 50 °C (24 h) in aluminum trays and weighed. Sand content of the aggregate classes (>  
18 0.053 mm) was determined by dispersing a 5 g subsample in sodium  
19 hexametaphosphate solution (5 g/l) using a reciprocal shaker. Sand correction was  
20 performed for each aggregate-size class because it was not considered to be part of the  
21 aggregates (Elliott *et al.* 1991). Total SOC from the bulk soil and from each aggregate  
22 size-class were determined using the wet oxidation of the Walkley-Black method  
23 described by Nelson & Sommers (1996). Aggregate size classes with a cumulative  
24 weight smaller than 5 g were not considered when determining carbon content as there  
25 was insufficient material for SOC determination.

1 The data were analyzed using the SAS statistical software (SAS institute, 1990). To  
2 compare the effects of tillage treatments and soil depths within every experimental field,  
3 analysis of variance (ANOVA), for a randomized block design were performed using  
4 the procedure general linear model. When significant, differences among treatments and  
5 depths were declared at the 0.05 probability level of significance using Duncan's test.

6

7



## 1 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### 2 **Tillage effects on total SOC**

3 From 0 to 40 cm depth in the soil, total SOC concentration ranged between 4.3 and  
4 10.1, 3.6 and 12.87 and 4.5 and 13.6 g/kg at sites AG-1, AG-17 and SV-20, respectively  
5 (Table 2). Total SOC concentration was significantly greater under NT than under CT at  
6 the AG-1 site for the 0-5 and 5-10 cm depths but only in the first 0-5 cm at the AG-17  
7 site (Table 2). However, when vertical tillage was implemented as CT (SV-20 field) a  
8 significantly larger concentration of SOC was found in the 5-10 cm depth compared to  
9 NT (Table 2). When soil bulk density was taken into account in calculating total amount  
10 of carbon, differences between tillage systems were only found at the 0-5 cm soil depth  
11 for the AG-1 and AG-17 experimental fields, and at the 5-10 cm soil depth in AG-1  
12 (Table 3) with approximately 50% less total SOC content in the CT treatment compared  
13 with NT. Throughout the entire sampling profile (0-40 cm), no differences were found  
14 between tillage systems in any of the experimental fields (Table 3). This fact could be  
15 partly explained with the slight differences on carbon inputs between tillage treatments.  
16 On average, the production of carbon inputs for the whole experimental length was  
17 6341 and 4919 kg/ha in the AG-1, 6637 and 6097 kg/ha in the AG-17 and 9191 and  
18 9616 kg/ha in the SV-20, for the NT and CT treatments, respectively.

19 Several studies have reported SOC accumulation under NT in surface soil (Deen &  
20 Kataki, 2003; Franzluebbbers, 2002; Hernanz et al., 2009). Under NT crop residues are  
21 deposited on the soil surface where a slower decomposition occurs because of drier  
22 conditions and reduced mineral nutrient availability (Kern & Johnson, 1993; Paustian *et*  
23 *al.*, 1997). By contrast, at deeper depths, tillage mixes organic residues with soil  
24 (Balesdent *et al.*, 2000; Franzluebbbers, 2004).

1 It was notable that after 1 year, the NT treatment at the AG-1 field showed twice as  
2 much SOC as the CT treatment at the 0-5 cm depth (Table 3). This difference between  
3 NT and CT in SOC for the 0-5 cm soil depth was the same as that observed in the AG-  
4 17 field, after 17 years under NT (Table 2). The historical tillage management before  
5 the imposition of this experiment consisted of tillage system which could over years  
6 lead to an accumulation of SOC in the topsoil. This SOC on the soil surface was lost  
7 after just one pass of mouldboard ploughing in the CT treatment since no SOC  
8 redistribution at depth was reflected in the observed values (Tables 2 and 3). Similar  
9 SOC loss has been observed by other authors when ploughing a previously minimum-  
10 tilled land (Stockfisch *et al.*, 1999).

11 In our study, mouldboard ploughing resulted in SOC accumulation to greater depth in  
12 CT than in NT in the AG-17 field. This accumulation balanced the smaller amount of  
13 SOC under CT near the soil surface and, as a result, SOC stocks under CT and NT in  
14 the whole studied depth (0-40 cm) were similar (Table 3). Recently, Angers & Eriksen-  
15 Hamel (2008) compiled SOC data from both full inversion tillage and NT soil profiles  
16 located in different long-term experiments. These authors observed that, when  
17 comparing with NT, soil under CT accumulated SOC below the 20 cm depth. In our  
18 study, despite individual values for a given horizon being significant different between  
19 treatments, there was a trend towards SOC accumulation in CT compared to NT for the  
20 20-30 and 30-40 cm depths in the AG-17 field (Table 3) with 25% - 50% higher SOC  
21 content in CT compared to NT. However, at the other two sites (SV-20 and AG-1) there  
22 was no such trend. As stated in the Material and Methods section, at the SV-20 site,  
23 primary tillage involved subsoiling to a depth of 40 cm. The lack of differences in SOC  
24 content between CT and NT below 5 cm depth in SV-20 may be attributed to the fact  
25 that this tillage implement mixed the residues more uniformly through the top 15 cm

1 and did not bury straw at the plough sole. This fact could have a significant effect not  
2 only on the amount of crop residues incorporated into the soil but also on the edaphic  
3 conditions and related SOC mineralization resulting from tillage.

#### 4 **Tillage effects on aggregate-size classes**

6 In AG-1, after one year under experimentation, differences in water-stable  
7 macroaggregates between tillage treatments were found in all the soil depths except at  
8 the 0-5 cm (Figure 1). At 5-10 cm depth, more small and large macroaggregates were  
9 found in NT compared to CT. However, below 10 cm, more soil macroaggregates were  
10 found in CT compared to NT (Figure 1). Differences in total SOC concentration  
11 between tillage treatments were only measured at 0-5 and 5-10 cm depths (Table 2).  
12 Therefore, the greater amount of macroaggregates found in CT compared to NT below  
13 10 cm depth were not accompanied by greater total SOC concentration. Also, in AG-1,  
14 the amounts of large and small macroaggregates decreased significantly with soil depth  
15 in NT but not in CT (Figure 1).

16 In the AG-17 field, significant differences were found between tillage systems in the  
17 large and small macroaggregate fractions at 0-5 and 5-10 cm soil depths and in the large  
18 macroaggregate fraction at 10-20 cm depth (Figure 2). At 0-5 and 5-10 cm depth, the  
19 proportion of large macroaggregates ranged from 0.03 to 0.05 g/g dry soil in CT and  
20 from 0.17 to 0.31 g/g dry soil in the NT treatment (Figure 2). In the surface soil layer  
21 under NT, more macroaggregates were found compared to CT, corresponding to greater  
22 SOC content, as found in other studies (Beare *et al.*, 1994; Zibilske & Bradford, 2007;  
23 Álvaro-Fuentes *et al.*, 2008b; Álvaro-Fuentes *et al.*, 2009). This trend did not continue  
24 at depth, where greater total SOC found under CT compared to NT at 20-30 and 30-40

1 cm depths were not accompanied by greater soil macroaggregates. No differences were  
2 found between tillage systems for any fraction in the SV-20 field (Figure 3).

3 In the three fields, except at the soil surface at AG-17, differences in total SOC  
4 concentration between treatments were not accompanied by differences in soil  
5 macroaggregates (Table 2). Chaney & Swift (1984) suggested that total SOC may not  
6 be sufficient to explain differences in aggregate stability and that certain SOM fractions  
7 may play a more important role.

8

### 9 **Tillage effects on C concentration in the water-stable aggregate fractions**

10 Not enough large macroaggregates were obtained for subsequent C concentration  
11 analyses for most of the depths and tillage treatments of the three experimental sites  
12 (Tables 4, 5 and 6). At AG-1, the average sand-free C concentration of the small  
13 macroaggregates, microaggregates and silt-plus clay-sized particles were 19.5, 8.6, 4.5  
14 and 22.5, 10.2, 4.9 g/kg dry soil in CT and NT, respectively (Table 4). The C  
15 concentration increased with the aggregate size as found in similar studies (Elliott,  
16 1986; Oades & Waters, 1991). Significant differences between tillage systems were  
17 only found at the 0-5 and the 5-10 cm depths for the microaggregate fraction (Table 4).

18 At 0-5 cm depth of AG-17, greater macroaggregate and microaggregate C  
19 concentrations were observed in NT compared to CT. However, at the 20-30 and 30-40  
20 cm depths the opposite trend was observed, with greater aggregate C concentration in  
21 CT compared to NT (Table 5) similar to the trend found in the total SOC (Table 2).

22 At AG-17, sand correction affected greatly the differences in the C concentration for the  
23 small macroaggregate fraction between tillage systems. For instance, in the small  
24 macroaggregates in the 0-5 cm soil layer, aggregate C concentration without correcting  
25 for sand content was significantly greater in NT compared to CT. However, when

1 corrected, C concentration in small macroaggregates was similar in both tillage  
2 treatments (Table 5). In our experiment, the use of inversion tillage (i.e. mouldboard  
3 ploughing) for several years led to either the redistribution of the sand particles within  
4 the soil profile or the erosion of the clay and silt particles from the soil surface resulting  
5 in a greater sand proportion in CT compared with NT. Caravaca *et al.* (2004) pointed  
6 out that the intensively tilled soils of semiarid Mediterranean areas are likely to become  
7 degraded by losing their organo-mineral fine particle-size fractions.

8 In the SV-20 field, a significantly greater C concentration was found at in aggregates  
9 from the 10-20 cm where higher SOC was found in the small macroaggregates,  
10 microaggregates and sand-plus clay-sized particles (Table 6). The CT treatment with  
11 subsoil tillage left enough sample weight to determine the C concentration of the large  
12 microaggregates in both NT and CT but only for the 0-5 and 5-10 cm soil depths (Table  
13 6).

14 The greater C concentration in the small macroaggregate fraction found at the soil  
15 surface under the NT treatment compared to CT in the two fields with mouldboard  
16 ploughing as CT (i.e. AG-1 and AG-17) was in agreement with other similar studies  
17 (Beare *et al.*, 1994; Zibilske & Bradford, 2007; Álvaro-Fuentes, 2009). In  
18 Mediterranean Spain, aggregate stability has been shown to increase with the reduction  
19 of tillage intensity in the soil surface (Hernanz *et al.*, 2002; Álvaro-Fuentes, 2008b),  
20 likely due to greater SOC stabilization of microaggregates within macroaggregates  
21 (Álvaro-Fuentes *et al.*, 2009). Six *et al.*, (1998, 1999) proposed a model in which slower  
22 macroaggregate turnover rate under NT was the main mechanism for C sequestration.  
23 Consequently, SOC accumulated in the top 5 cm was occluded by soil macroaggregates  
24 in NT due to lower aggregate turnover rates. However, in the AG-17 field with  
25 mouldboard ploughing after 17 years, greater SOC concentration was found in the small

1 macroaggregates under CT below the first 20 cm depth (Table 5). As mentioned before,  
2 below 20 cm depth, 25% - 50% higher total SOC content was observed in CT compared  
3 to NT at AG-17 (Table 3). When mixing crop residues at depth (full inversion tillage  
4 case), residue C is located closely in contact with mineral soil particles (Angers &  
5 Eriksen-Hamel, 2008). In a laboratory study, Stemmer et al. (1999) compared the  
6 distribution of corn-derived organic matter between different residue locations. The  
7 authors concluded that organic matter is more protected within inorganic compounds  
8 when mixed into the soil than when left over the soil surface. As a result, they observed  
9 greater fraction of SOC moved into the stable SOC pool in tilled than in untilled soil.  
10 Therefore, the silt-plus clay-sized particles may play an important role on the protection  
11 of SOC, especially in deeper horizons (Poirier, et al., 2009). Moreover, more adverse  
12 microenvironmental conditions for the decomposers in the plow layer in the CT  
13 treatment may restrict the mineralization of SOC (Poirier, et al., 2009). However,  
14 macroaggregate content was similar between tillage treatments below 20 cm depth.  
15 Slower decomposition of crop residues incorporated by tillage to depth (Olchin *et al.*,  
16 2008) could lead to the build up of soil aggregates by fresh C incorporated in the CT  
17 treatment, resulting in greater macroaggregate C concentration, but without differences  
18 in macroaggregate fraction contents between treatments. As suggested recently by  
19 Angers & Eriksen-Hamel (2008), mechanisms controlling C stabilization deep in the  
20 soil profile require further investigation.

21

22

1 **CONCLUSIONS**

2 In the rainfed semiarid agroecosystems studied, we observed under NT an increase in  
3 SOC content only in the surface layer, whereas we observed an increase in SOC  
4 concentration below 20 cm depth under the CT mouldboard treatment, when this tillage  
5 system had been performed for 17 years. However, at the 0-40 cm soil depth, NT  
6 compared to CT did not show any differences in total SOC content. After 17 years  
7 under NT, the highest SOC in the 0-5 cm depth under NT was accompanied by both  
8 higher macroaggregate content and higher aggregate C concentration. But after only one  
9 year under NT, in the 0-5 cm depth the greater SOC content was not accompanied either  
10 by differences in macroaggregate content or macroaggregate C concentration.  
11 Mouldboard ploughing resulted in greater total SOC concentration and macroaggregate  
12 C concentration below 20 cm than NT, but vertical tillage did not. The generally  
13 accepted notion that tillage reduction is the most beneficial practice for SOC  
14 sequestration must be considered with caution. This study emphasizes the complex  
15 relationship among tillage, soil aggregation and SOC stabilization in soil depth and so it  
16 will require further investigation to clarify the relative importance of these mechanisms.

17

18

19 **Acknowledgments**

20 The field and laboratory technicians Silvia Martí and Carlos Cortés are gratefully  
21 acknowledged. Also we acknowledge the collaboration of Jorge Lampurlanés in the  
22 statistical analysis and Cathy Stewart for her comments and suggestions on the  
23 manuscript. This research was supported by the Comision Interministerial de Ciencia y  
24 Tecnologia of Spain (AGL 2004-07763-C02-02 and AGL 2007-66320-C02). The first  
25 author was awarded with a fellowship by the Spanish Ministry of Education.

26

1 **REFERENCES**

- 2
- 3 Álvaro-Fuentes, J., López, M.V., Arrúe, J.L. & Cantero-Martínez, C. 2008a.  
4 Management effects on soil carbon dioxide fluxes under semiarid Mediterranean  
5 conditions. *Soil Science Society American Journal*, **72**, 194-200.
- 6 Álvaro-Fuentes, J., Arrúe, J.L., Gracia, R. & López, M.V. 2008b. Tillage and cropping  
7 intensification effects on soil aggregation, temporal dynamics and controlling factors  
8 under semiarid conditions. *Geoderma*, **145**, 390-396.
- 9 Álvaro-Fuentes, J., Cantero-Martínez, C., López, M.V., Paustian, K., Denef, K.,  
10 Stewart, C.E. & Arrúe, J.L. 2009. Soil Aggregation and Soil Organic Carbon  
11 Stabilization: Effects of Management in Semiarid Mediterranean Agroecosystems. *Soil*  
12 *Science Society American Journal*, **73**, 1519-1529.
- 13 Amézketa, E. 1999. Soil aggregate stability, a review. *Journal of Sustainable*  
14 *Agriculture*, **14**, 83-151.
- 15 Angers, D.A. & Eriksen-Hamel, N.S. 2008. Full-inversion tillage and organic carbon  
16 distribution in soil profiles: a meta-analysis. *Soil Science Society American Journal*, **72**,  
17 1370-1374.
- 18 Balesdent, J., Chenu, C. & Balabane, M. 2000. Relationship of soil organic matter  
19 dynamics to physical protection and tillage. *Soil & Tillage Research*, **53**, 215-230.
- 20 Baker, J.M., Ochsner, T.E., Venterea, R.T. & Griffis, T.J. 2007. Tillage and soil carbon  
21 sequestration - What do we really know?. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment*, **118**,  
22 1-5
- 23 Beare, M.H., Hendrix, P.F. & Coleman, D.C. 1994. Water-Stable Aggregates and  
24 Organic Matter Fractions in Conventional and No-Tillage Soils. *Soil Science Society*  
25 *American Journal*, **58**, 777-786.



1 Bronick, C.J. & Lal, R. 2005. Soil structure and management, a review. *Geoderma*, **124**,  
2 3-22.

3 Cantero-Martínez, C., Angas, P. & Lampurlanes, J. 2007. Long-term yield and water-  
4 use efficiency under various tillage systems in Mediterranean rain-fed conditions.  
5 *Annals of Applied Biology*, **150**, 293-307

6 Caravaca, F., Lax, A. & Albadalejo, J. 2004. Aggregate stability and carbon  
7 characteristics of particle-size fractions in cultivated and forested soils of semiarid  
8 Spain. *Soil & Tillage Research*, **78**, 83-90.

9 Chaney, K. & Swift, R.S. 1984. The influence of organic matter on aggregate stability  
10 in some British soils. *Journal of Soil Science*, **35**, 223-230.

11 Deen, W. & Kataki, P.K. 2003. Carbon sequestration in a long-term conventional versus  
12 conservation tillage experiment. *Soil & Tillage Research*, **74**, 143-150.

13 Elliott, E.T. 1986. Aggregate structure and carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorous in native  
14 and cultivated soils. *Soil Science Society American Journal*, **50**, 627-633.

15 Elliott, E.T., Palm, C.A., Reuss, D.E. & Monz, C.A. 1991. Organic matter contained in  
16 soil aggregates from a tropical chronosequence, correction for sand and light fraction.  
17 *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment*, **34**, 443-451.

18 Follett, R.F. 2001. Soil management concepts and carbon sequestration in cropland  
19 soils. *Soil & Tillage Research*, **61**, 77-92.

20 Franzluebbers, A.J. 2002. Soil organic matter stratification ratio as an indicator of soil  
21 quality. *Soil & Tillage Research*, **66**, 95-106.

22 Franzluebbers, A.J. 2004. Tillage and residue management effects on soil organic  
23 matter. In: *Soil organic matter in sustainable agriculture* (eds F. Magdoff & R.R. Weil),  
24 CRC Press Boca Raton FL. USA. pp. 227-268.

- 1 Goss, M.J. & Kay, B.D. 2005. Soil Aggregation. In: *Roots and Soil Management:*  
2 *Interactions between Root and the Soil.* (eds S.F. Wright & R.W. Zobel), Agronomy  
3 Monograph No 48. ASA, CSSA, and SSSA, Madison, WI. USA. pp. 163-180.
- 4 Grossman, R.B., Reinsch, T.G. 2002. Bulk density and linear extensibility. *Methods of*  
5 *soil analysis. Part 4. Physical methods.* American Society of Agronomy, Soil Science  
6 Society of America. Madison, Wisconsin.. pp. 201–228.
- 7 Hernanz, J.L., López, R., Navarrete, L. & Sánchez-Girón, V. 2002. Long-term effects of  
8 tillage systems and rotations on soil structural stability and organic carbon stratification  
9 in semiarid central Spain. *Soil & Tillage Research.* **66**, 129-141.
- 10 Hernanz, J.L., Sánchez-Girón, V. & Navarrete, L. 2009. Soil carbon sequestration and  
11 stratification in a cereal/leguminous crop rotation with three tillage systems in semiarid  
12 conditions. *Soil & Tillage Research*, **133**, 114-122.
- 13 Kern, J.S. & Johnson, M.G. 1993. Conservation tillage impacts on national soil and  
14 atmospheric carbon levels. *Soil Science Society American Journal*, **57**, 200-210.
- 15 Krull, E.S., Baldock, J.A. & Skjemstad, J.O. 2003. Importance of mechanisms and  
16 processes of the stabilization of soil organic matter for modelling carbon  
17 turnover. *Functional Plant Biology*, **30**, 207-222.
- 18 Lal, R. 2004. Soil carbon sequestration to mitigate climate change. *Geoderma*, **123**, 1-  
19 22.
- 20 Nelson, D.W. & Sommers, L.E. 1996. Total Carbon, Organic Carbon and Organic  
21 Matter. In: *Methods of soil analysis. Part 3. Chemical methods.* American Society of  
22 Agronomy, Soil Science Society of America. Madison, Wisconsin. pp. 961-1010.
- 23 Oades, J. M. Waters, A.G. 1991. Aggregate hierarchy in soils. *Australian Journal of*  
24 *Soil Research*, **29**, 815-828.

1 Olchin, G.P., Ogle, S., Frey, S.D., Filley, T.R., Paustian, K. & Six, J. 2008. Residue  
2 carbon stabilization in soil aggregates of no-till and tillage management of dryland  
3 cropping systems. *Soil Science Society American Journal*, **72**, 507-513.

4 Paustian, K., Collins, H.P. & Paul, E.A. 1997. Management controls on soil carbon. In :  
5 *Soil organic matter in temperate agroecosystems. Long-term experiments in North*  
6 *America* (eds. E.A. Paul, K. Paustian, E.T. Elliott & C.V. Cole), CRC Press. Boca  
7 Raton, FL. USA, pp. 15-49.

8 Paustian, K., Cole, C.V., Sauerbeck, D. & Sampson, N. 1998. CO<sub>2</sub> mitigation by  
9 agriculture: an overview. *Climatic Change*, **40**, 135-162.

10 Peterson, G.A., Halvorson, A.D., Havlin, J.L., Jones, O.R., Lyon, D.J. & Tanaka, D.L.  
11 1998. Reduced tillage and increasing cropping intensity in the Great Plains conserves  
12 soil C. *Soil & Tillage Research*, **47**, 207-218.

13 Poirier, V., Angers, D.A., Rochette, P., Chantigny, M.H., Ziadi, N., Tremblay, G. &  
14 Fortin, J. 2009. Interactive effects of tillage and mineral fertilization on soil carbon  
15 profiles. *Soil Science Society American Journal*, **73**, 255-261.

16 Rasmussen, P.E., Albrecht, S.L. & Smiley, R.W. 1998. Soil C and N changes under  
17 tillage and cropping systems in semi-arid Pacific Northwest agriculture. *Soil & Tillage*  
18 *Research*, **47**, 197-205.

19 SAS Institute. 1990. *SAS user's guide, Statistics*. 6th ed. Vol. 2. SAS Inst., Cary, NC.  
20 USA.

21 Six, J., Elliott, E.T., Paustian, K. & Doran, J.W. 1998. Aggregation and soil organic  
22 matter accumulation in cultivated and native grassland soils. *Soil Science Society*  
23 *American Journal*, **62**, 1367-1377.

1 Six, J., Elliott, E.T. & Paustian, K. 1999. Aggregate and soil organic matter dynamics  
2 under conventional and no-tillage systems. *Soil Science Society American Journal*, **63**,  
3 1350-1358.

4 Six, J., Conant, R.T., Paul, E.A. & Paustian, K. 2002. Stabilization mechanisms of soil  
5 organic matter: implications for C-saturation of soils. *Plant and Soil*, **241**, 155-176.

6 Smith, P. 2004. Carbon sequestration in croplands: the potential in Europe and the  
7 global context. *European Journal of Agronomy*, **20**, 229-236.

8 Stemmer, M., Von Lutzow, M., Kandeler, E., Pichlmayer, F. & Gerzabek, M.H. 1999.  
9 The effect of maize straw placement on mineralization of C and N in soil particle size  
10 fractions. *European Journal of Soil Science*, **50**, 73-85.

11 Stockfisch, N., Forstreuter, T. & Ehlers, W. 1999. Ploughing effects on soil organic  
12 matter after twenty years of conservation tillage in Lower Saxony, Germany. *Soil &*  
13 *Tillage Research*, **52**, 91-101.

14 Tisdall, J. M. & Oades, J.M. 1982. Organic matter and water-stable aggregates in soils.  
15 *Journal of Soil Science*, **33**, 141-163.

16 Zibilske, L.M. & Bradford, J.M. 2007. Soil aggregation, aggregate carbon and nitrogen,  
17 and moisture retention induced by conservation tillage. *Soil Science Society American*  
18 *Journal*, **71**, 793-802.

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

1 **FIGURE CAPTIONS**

2

3 **Figure 1** Water-stable aggregate size distribution at 0-5, 5-10, 10-20, 20-30 and 30-40 cm soil  
4 depths as affected by tillage (CT, conventional tillage, NT, no-tillage) in Agramunt (AG-1, 1  
5 year old experiment). Error bars represent standard errors. For the same tillage system, different  
6 lower case letters indicate significant differences between depths at  $P<0.05$ . \* Indicate  
7 significant differences between tillage systems within the same soil depth at  $P<0.05$ .

8

9 **Figure 2** Water-stable aggregate size distribution at 0-5, 5-10, 10-20, 20-30 and 30-40 cm soil  
10 depths as affected by tillage (CT, conventional tillage, NT, no-tillage) in Agramunt (AG-17, 17  
11 year old experiment). Error bars represent standard errors. For the same tillage system, different  
12 letters indicate significant differences between depths at  $P<0.05$ . \* Indicate significant  
13 differences between tillage systems within the same soil depth at  $P<0.05$ .

14

15 **Figure 3** Water-stable aggregate size distribution at 0-5, 5-10, 10-20, 20-30 and 30-40 cm soil  
16 depths as affected by tillage (CT, conventional tillage, NT, no-tillage) in Selvanera (SV-20, 20  
17 year old experiment). Error bars represent standard errors. For the same tillage system, different  
18 letters indicate significant differences between depths at  $P<0.05$ . \* Indicate significant  
19 differences between tillage systems within the same soil depth at  $P<0.05$ .

20

1 **Table 1** Site and general soil characteristics for the Ap horizon at the three experimental sites

2 § According to the USDA classification (Soil Survey Staff, 1975).

3

	Agramunt (AG-1)	Agramunt (AG-17)	Selvanera (SV-20)
Year of establishment	2006	1990	1987
Latitude	41° 48' N	41° 48' N	41° 49' N
Longitude	1° 07' E	1° 07' E	1° 17' E
Elevation (m)	330	330	475
Annual precipitation (mm)	430	430	475
Annual ETo (mm)	855	855	800
Soil Classification §	Fluventic Xerochrept	Typic Xerofluvent	Fluventic Xerochrept
Ap horizon Depth (cm)	25	23	28
pH (H <sub>2</sub> O, 1,2.5)	8.4	8.5	8.3
EC <sub>1,5</sub> (dS/m)	0.17	0.15	0.16
CaCO <sub>3</sub> eq. (%)	38	40	35
Water retention (kg/kg)			
-33 kPa	0.22	0.16	0.16
- 1500 kpa	0.07	0.05	0.04
Particle Size Distribution (%)			
Sand (2000 - 50 µm)	23.9	30.1	36.5
Silt (50 – 2 µm)	55.0	51.9	46.4
Clay (<2 µm)	21.1	17.9	17.1

4

1 **Table 2** Total soil organic carbon (SOC) distribution under conventional tillage (CT) and no-  
 2 tillage (NT) in Agramunt (AG-1 and AG-17, 1 and 17 years old experiment, respectively) and  
 3 Selvanera (SV-20) sites.

4 ¶ Within each tillage system and field, different letters indicate significant differences between depths at  
 5  $P < 0.05$ .

6 \* Within each field and depth values are significantly different between tillage systems at  $P < 0.05$

7 ‡ Values in parenthesis are the standard errors of the mean

8

Soil depth (cm)	SOC (g/kg)					
	AG-1		AG-17		SV-20	
	CT	NT	CT	NT	CT	NT
0 – 5	5.1 (0.9)*‡	10.1 (1.0) a¶	6.3 (0.4)*	12.9 (1.4) a	9.6 (0.2) a	13.6 (1.9) a
5 – 10	5.3 (0.6)*	7.7 (0.8) b	6.3 (0.5)	7.9 (0.7) b	8.3 (0.3)* b	6.9 (0.1) b
10 – 20	6.1 (1.1)	5.3 (0.3) c	5.9 (0.2)	5.4 (0.3) c	6.5 (0.7) c	4.9 (0.1) b
20 – 30	5.5 (0.6)	4.7 (0.2) c	6.1 (0.3)*	4.3 (0.5) cd	5.1 (0.3) d	4.8 (0.3) b
30 – 40	4.6 (0.2)	4.3 (0.0) c	5.7 (0.4)*	3.6 (0.4) d	4.5 (0.3) d	4.8 (0.6) b

9

10

1 **Table 3** Soil organic carbon (SOC) content under conventional tillage (CT) and no-tillage (NT)  
 2 in Agramunt (AG-1 and AG-17, 1 and 17 years old experiment, respectively) and Selvanera  
 3 (SV-20) sites.

4 \* Within each field and depth values are significantly different between tillage systems at  $P < 0.05$

5

Site	Soil depth (cm)	CT		NT	
		Bulk density (g/cm <sup>-3</sup> )	SOC (kg/ha)	Bulk density (g/cm <sup>-3</sup> )	SOC (kg/ha)
AG-1	0 – 5	1.34	3371*	1.29	6499
	5 – 10	1.33*	3498*	1.45	5694
	10 – 20	1.33	8152	1.44	7610
	20 – 30	1.32*	7274	1.47	6875
	30 – 40	1.33	6044	1.42	6115
	0 – 40		28340		32794
AG-17	0 – 5	1.41	4460*	1.31	8267
	5 – 10	1.41*	4417	1.53	5986
	10 – 20	1.38*	8169	1.53	8288
	20 – 30	1.37*	8409	1.55	6655
	30 – 40	1.48	8481	1.49	5429
	0 – 40		33938		34627
SV-20	0 – 5	1.20	5795	1.16	7937
	5 – 10	1.40	5780	1.47	5069
	10 – 20	1.54	10048	1.59	7849
	20 – 30	1.48	7599	1.59	7545
	30 – 40	1.53	6825	1.59	7611
	0 – 40		36048		36010

6

7



1 **Table 4** Soil organic carbon (SOC) and sand-free soil organic carbon (SOC sand-free)  
 2 concentrations in different water-stable aggregate classes under conventional tillage (CT) and  
 3 no-tillage (NT) in Agramunt (AG-1, 1 year old experiment, respectively) at 0-40 cm soil depth.

4 ¶ Within each tillage system and water-stable aggregate fraction, different letters indicate significant  
 5 differences between depths at  $P < 0.05$ .

6 \* Within each depth and water-stable aggregate fraction values are significantly different between tillage  
 7 systems at  $P < 0.05$

8 ‡ Values in parenthesis are the standard errors of the mean

9  
 10

Soil depth (cm)	Water-stable aggregate classes (mm)	AG-1			
		SOC (g/kg)		SOC (g/kg) sand-free	
		CT	NT	CT	NT
0-5	> 2	- -	14.9 (1.4)	- -	21.2 (4.7)
	0.250 – 2	9.1 (2.7)‡	14.8a¶ (1.5)	19.2 (3.1)	27.7 (2.8)
	0.050 – 0.250	3.8 (2.0)	8.5a (0.8)	6.3 (3.2)*	14.5a (0.8)
	< 0.053	4.6 (0.2)	6.3a (0.6)	4.6 (0.2)	6.3a (0.6)
5-10	> 2	- -	11.3 (1.1)	- -	14.0 (1.4)
	0.250 – 2	9.6 (3.2)	13.3a (2.0)	21.0 (2.7)	23.7 (1.5)
	0.050 – 0.250	4.7 (1.0)*	7.6b (0.7)	8.3 (0.8)*	13.1a (0.1)
	< 0.053	4.7 (0.3)	5.6b (0.3)	4.6 (0.3)	5.6b (0.3)
10-20	> 2	8.7 (4.6)	- -	10.1 (5.2)	- -
	0.250 – 2	10.2 (3.1)	8.1b (2.2)	21.8 (2.7)	22.2 (1.8)
	0.050 – 0.250	5.1 (0.8)	4.9c (0.5)	10.3 (0.3)	7.9b (0.8)
	< 0.053	4.7 (0.2)	4.6c (0.2)	4.7 (0.2)	4.6c (0.2)
20-30	> 2	6.6 (3.4)	- -	7.8 (3.9)	-
	0.250 – 2	10.2 (2.2)	7.9b (2.4)	19.9 (1.4)	20.8 (1.0)
	0.050 – 0.250	5.2 (0.3)	4.7c (0.4)	9.5 (0.6)	8.1b (0.1)
	< 0.053	4.5 (0.1)	4.2cd (0.3)	4.5 (0.1)	4.2cd (0.3)
30-40	> 2	- -	- -	- -	- -
	0.250 – 2	7.4 (1.1)	7.0b (1.3)	15.8 (0.8)	18.1 (2.3)
	0.050 – 0.250	4.6 (0.7)	4.6c (0.3)	8.5 (1.7)	7.4b (0.5)
	< 0.053	4.2 (0.3)	4.0d (0.4)	4.2 (0.3)	4.0d (0.4)

11

12

1 **Table 5** Soil organic carbon (SOC) and sand-free soil organic carbon (SOC sand-free)  
2 concentrations in different water-stable aggregate classes under conventional tillage (CT) and  
3 no-tillage (NT) in Agramunt (AG-17, 17 year old experiment, respectively) at 0-40 cm soil  
4 depth.  
5 ¶ Within each tillage system and water-stable aggregate fraction, different letters indicate significant  
6 differences between depths at  $P<0.05$ .  
7 \* Within each depth and water-stable aggregate fraction values are significantly different between tillage  
8 systems at  $P<0.05$   
9 ‡ Values in parenthesis are the standard errors of the mean

10

11


Soil Depth (cm)	Water-stable aggregate classes (mm)	AG-17							
		SOC (g/kg)				SOC (g/kg) sand-free			
		CT		NT		CT		NT	
0-5	> 2	-	-	12.1	(4.0)	-	-	12.8	(4.3)
	0.250 – 2	11.6	(1.2)*‡	19.5a¶	(2.4)	31.2	(2.7)	27.9a	(2.8)
	0.050 – 0.250	5.4a	(0.3)*	9.7a	(0.9)	9.3	(0.3)*	17.5a	(1.8)
	< 0.053	5.1	(0.2)*	7.4a	(0.8)	5.1	(0.2)*	7.4a	(0.8)
5-10	> 2	-	-	10.3	(0.4)	-	-	11.8	(3.9)
	0.250 – 2	12.9	(1.4)	14.3b	(1.3)	32.8	(2.5)*	24.4a	(1.3)
	0.050 – 0.250	5.5a	(0.6)	6.7b	(0.5)	10.2	(0.7)	13.0b	(0.9)
	< 0.053	5.0	(0.1)	5.7b	(0.4)	5.0	(0.1)	5.7b	(0.4)
10-20	> 2	-	-	11.0	(0.1)	-	-	13.0	(1.1)
	0.250 – 2	13.1	(1.2)	10.1c	(0.6)	29.6	(1.9)	25.8a	(2.0)
	0.050 – 0.250	5.3a	(0.6)	4.6c	(0.2)	10.1	(1.2)	8.3c	(0.6)
	< 0.053	5.1	(0.2)	4.5c	(0.4)	5.1	(0.2)	4.5c	(0.4)
20-30	> 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	0.250 – 2	13.3	(1.5)*	6.8d	(1.5)	33.1	(0.8)*	18.8b	(2.7)
	0.050 – 0.250	5.6a	(0.4)	3.9cd	(0.6)	11.5	(0.4)*	7.0c	(1.1)
	< 0.053	4.8	(0.3)	4.2cd	(0.6)	4.8	(0.3)	4.2cd	(0.6)
30-40	> 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	0.250 – 2	11.4	(1.3)*	5.2d	(1.1)	33.9	(4.9)*	17.1b	(3.0)
	0.050 – 0.250	4.6b	(0.3)*	3.2d	(0.3)	8.9	(0.4)*	5.6c	(0.6)
	< 0.053	4.9	(0.4)	3.7d	(0.7)	4.9	(0.4)	3.7d	(0.7)

1 **Table 6** Soil organic carbon (SOC) and sand-free soil organic carbon (SOC sand-free)  
2 concentrations in different water-stable aggregate classes under conventional tillage (CT) and  
3 no-tillage (NT) in Selvanera (SV-20, 20 year old experiment, respectively) at 0-40 cm soil  
4 depth.  
5 ¶ Within each tillage system and water-stable aggregate fraction, different letters indicate significant  
6 differences between depths at  $P<0.05$ .  
7 \* Within each depth and water-stable aggregate fraction values are significantly different between tillage  
8 systems at  $P<0.05$   
9 ‡ Values in parenthesis are the standard errors of the mean

Soil depth (cm)	Water-stable aggregate classes (mm)	SV-20							
		SOC (g/kg)				SOC (g/kg) sand-free			
		CT		NT		CT		NT	
0-5	> 2	14.0	(1.8)‡	19.0	(1.9)	27.1	(8.2)	30.7	(7.9)
	0.250 – 2	15.5a	(0.6)	20.0a¶	(2.2)	34.0	(4.4)	33.8a	(4.5)
	0.050 – 0.250	9.6a	(0.5)	11.3a	(1.3)	20.0a	(1.1)	24.5a	(3.5)
	< 0.053	8.4a	(0.6)	10.1a	(1.3)	8.4a	(0.6)	10.1a	(1.3)
5-10	> 2	7.0	(3.5)	13.5	(0.8)	28.4	(16)	22.6	(2.9)
	0.250 – 2	14.6a	(4.9)	12.3b	(1.8)	21.5	(11)	26.1b	(2.8)
	0.050 – 0.250	8.5ab	(0.4)	7.4b	(0.4)	17.8a	(0.6)	17.6b	(1.3)
	< 0.053	7.7a	(0.3)	6.8a	(0.3)	7.7a	(0.3)	6.8b	(0.3)
10-20	> 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	0.250 – 2	10.5b	(0.4)*	5.8c	(0.5)	26.5	(2.5)*	17.4c	(0.4)
	0.050 – 0.250	7.0bc	(0.3)*	4.6c	(0.3)	13.6 b	(0.9)*	10.0c	(0.2)
	< 0.053	7.7a	(0.5)*	5.7a	(0.0)	7.7b	(0.5)*	5.7b	(0.0)
20-30	> 2	-	-	4.2	(2.8)	-	-	16.4	(9.4)
	0.250 – 2	6.3c	(0.6)	4.4c	(0.6)	23.6	(3.4)	13.2c	(0.8)
	0.050 – 0.250	5.1d	(0.4)	4.2c	(0.1)	11.2bc	(0.7)	9.3c	(0.3)
	< 0.053	6.2b	(0.7)	5.2a	(0.4)	6.2b	(0.7)	5.2b	(0.4)
30-40	> 2	-	-	-	-	9.2	(9.2)	11.9	(12)
	0.250 – 2	5.6c	(1.3)	4.3c	(0.4)	11.4	(1.1)	13.0c	(1.5)
	0.050 – 0.250	5.5cd	(0.8)	4.4c	(0.3)	10.0c	(0.7)	8.8c	(1.0)
	< 0.053	6.0b	(0.5)	4.8b	(0.6)	6.0b	(0.5)	4.8b	(0.6)

12


13



1


2

3 **Figure 1**



1  
2  
3  
4  
5

**Figure 2**



1  
2

3 **Figure 3**