



**HAL**  
open science

## **Environmental factors controlling soil organic carbon stability in French forest soils**

Laure Soucémarianadin, Lauric Cécillon, Bertrand Guenet, Claire Chenu, François Baudin, Manuel Nicolas, Cyril Girardin, Pierre Barré

► **To cite this version:**

Laure Soucémarianadin, Lauric Cécillon, Bertrand Guenet, Claire Chenu, François Baudin, et al.. Environmental factors controlling soil organic carbon stability in French forest soils. *Plant and Soil*, 2018, 426 (1-2), pp.267-286. 10.1007/s11104-018-3613-x . hal-01744147

**HAL Id: hal-01744147**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01744147>**

Submitted on 27 Mar 2018

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 Environmental factors controlling soil organic carbon stability in French forest

2 soils

3

4

5 Laure N. Soucémarianadin<sup>1,\*</sup>, Lauric Cécillon<sup>2</sup>, Bertrand Guenet<sup>3</sup>, Claire Chenu<sup>4</sup>, François

6 Baudin<sup>5</sup>, Manuel Nicolas<sup>6</sup>, Cyril Girardin<sup>4</sup> and Pierre Barré<sup>1</sup>

7

8 <sup>1</sup> Laboratoire de Géologie, PSL Research University, CNRS-ENS UMR8538, Paris, France

9 <sup>2</sup> Université Grenoble Alpes, Irstea, UR LESSEM, St-Martin-d'Hères, France

10 <sup>3</sup> Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement, LSCE/IPSL, CEA-CNRS-

11 UVSQ, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

12 <sup>4</sup> AgroParisTech-INRA, UMR ECOSYS, Thiverval-Grignon, France

13 <sup>5</sup> Sorbonne-Université/UPMC, IStEP, Paris, France

14 <sup>6</sup> Office National des Forêts, R&D, Fontainebleau, France

15

16 \* Corresponding author: Laure Soucémarianadin, [souce@geologie.ens.fr](mailto:souce@geologie.ens.fr)

17 Laboratoire de Géologie (UMR 8538) Ecole Normale Supérieure, 24 Rue Lhomond 75231

18 Paris CEDEX 5, France; phone: +331 44 32 22 94; fax: +331 44 32 22 00

19

20

21

22

23 Type: Regular article

24 **Abstract**

25 **Aims**

26 In temperate forests, soils contain a large part of the ecosystem carbon that can be partially  
27 lost or gained upon global change. Our aim was to identify the factors controlling soil organic  
28 carbon (SOC) stability in a wide part of French forests.

29

30 **Methods**

31 Using a set of soils from 53 French forest sites, we assessed the effects of depth (up to 1 m),  
32 soil class (dystric Cambisol; eutric Cambisol; entic Podzol), vegetation types (deciduous;  
33 coniferous) and climate (continental influence; oceanic influence; mountainous influence) on  
34 SOC stability using indicators derived from laboratory incubation, physical fractionation and  
35 thermal analysis.

36

37 **Results**

38 Labile SOC pools decreased while stable SOC pool increased with depth. Soil class also  
39 significantly influenced SOC stability. Eutric Cambisols had less labile SOC in surface layers  
40 but had more labile SOC at depth (> 40 cm) than the other soil classes. Vegetation influenced  
41 thermal indicators of SOC pools mainly in topsoils (0–10 cm). Mountainous climate forest  
42 soils had a low thermal SOC stability.

43

44 **Conclusions**

45 On top of the expected effect of depth, this study also illustrates the noticeable effect of soil  
46 class on SOC stability. It suggests that environmental variables should be included when  
47 mapping climate regulation soil service.

48

49

50 **Keywords:** forest soils, particulate organic matter fractionation, pedology, Rock-Eval 6, soil  
51 basal respiration, soil organic carbon persistence

52

53 **Abbreviations:** soil organic carbon (SOC), Rock-Eval 6 (RE6), particulate organic matter  
54 (POM), Oxygen index (OI<sub>RE6</sub>), Hydrogen index (HI), Hydrocarbons (HC)

55

56

## 57 Introduction

58 Forest ecosystems play a central role in the global carbon (C) cycle with their high potential  
59 for atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2000; Smith  
60 et al. 2014). About half of the terrestrial C sink is indeed located in forests (Canadell et al.  
61 2007) and forest soils in particular store around 398 Pg C (Kindermann et al. 2008). The  
62 temperate biome holds a quarter of the world's forests (Tyrrell et al. 2012) and soils in  
63 temperate forests have twice as much carbon as the vegetation (Jarvis et al. 2005). Temperate  
64 forest soils have also constituted a C sink for over two decades (Pan et al. 2011; Tyrrell et al.  
65 2012) with parts of the European—and particularly French (Jonard et al. 2017)—forest soils  
66 being particularly efficient at sequestering C (*e.g.*, Nabuurs et al., 2008). The contribution of  
67 deep soil to soil organic carbon (SOC) stocks has been previously highlighted (Jobbágy and  
68 Jackson 2000; Rumpel and Kögel-Knabner 2010), however there is still a lack of data on  
69 deep/subsoil mineral (> 30 cm depth) SOC stocks (*e.g.*, Tyrrell et al. 2012).  
70 SOC is made up of very heterogeneous compounds (Amundson 2001; Trumbore 1997) with  
71 turnover times ranging from a few days/weeks to several centuries and, for modelling

72 purposes, can be roughly divided into active (labile), intermediate and passive (persistent)  
73 SOC kinetic pools.

74 Labile SOC is the most likely to be quickly affected by climate or land-use changes (Carter et  
75 al. 1998; Zhang et al. 2007), thus potentially contributing further to global warming.

76 Moreover, because of the central role of the SOC labile pool in short-to medium-term nutrient  
77 availability and soil structural stability (Wander 2004), its evolutions could have major effects  
78 on biomass (food/timber/etc.) production. Conversely when considering SOC long-term  
79 storage and possible sequestration, soils in which most of the total SOC is stable will perform  
80 better than soils with a greater proportion of their total SOC as labile SOC (Jandl et al. 2007;  
81 Lorenz and Lal 2010; Prescott 2010). It is thus essential to determine how much labile and  
82 persistent SOC are present in soils.

83 Despite being of such interest, there is still no standard technique to assess SOC stability but a  
84 set of complementary techniques are available. Respiration measurements and particulate  
85 organic matter (POM) quantification obtained by various methods of fractionation (density  
86 only / density + particle-size) (von Lützow et al. 2007) have been used for decades and are  
87 traditional metrics of SOC lability. Although the respired-C and POM-C fractions both  
88 represent a labile SOC pool, the former corresponds to a smaller SOC pool with a shorter  
89 mean residence time (usually < 1 year for temperate in-situ conditions) (Feng et al. 2016)  
90 while the latter corresponds to a larger SOC pool with a longer mean residence time (usually  
91 < 20 year for temperate conditions (*e.g.*, Balesdent 1996; Trumbore et al. 1996). This longer  
92 residence time may result from interactions with the soil structure; part of the POM-C fraction  
93 being occluded in micro-aggregates and protected from microbial respiration for longer time  
94 scales (Six et al. 2002). The mean residence time of the POM-C fraction can also exceed 20  
95 years, especially in cold and mountainous areas (Leifeld et al. 2009) or in areas affected by  
96 wildfires where the POM-C fraction may contain large amounts of pyrogenic carbon with

97 residence time in soils greater than the mean residence time of total SOC. Nevertheless, it has  
98 been shown that the POM-C fraction of temperate and mountainous soils of agroecosystems  
99 correspond roughly to the resistant material pools (RPM) of the RothC model (Zimmerman et  
100 al. 2007), which has a turnover rate of 3 years (Coleman and Jenkinson 1999). In this paper,  
101 the respired-C fraction will be referred to as the highly-labile SOC pool and the POM-C  
102 fraction will be termed labile SOC pool.

103 Thermal analysis techniques have also been used to characterize soil organic matter (SOM)  
104 stability (*e.g.*, Plante et al. 2009). Among them, Rock-Eval 6 (RE6) analysis has shown  
105 promising results in the determination of SOM biogeochemical stability (Barré et al. 2016;  
106 Gregorich et al. 2015; Saenger et al. 2015; Sebag et al. 2016). RE6-derived parameters are  
107 reliable indicators of the stable SOC pool (Barré et al. 2016; Cécillon et al. 2018) and can be a  
108 useful complement to the aforementioned usual indicators of the labile SOC pool  
109 (Soucémariadin et al. 2018). Specifically, one RE6-derived parameter,  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$ , which  
110 corresponds to the temperature at which 50% of the hydrocarbons released as pyrolysis  
111 effluents during SOM pyrolysis have evolved, was linked to the highly-labile and the labile  
112 SOC pools (Gregorich et al. 2015; Soucémariadin et al., 2018). In French forest soils,  
113  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$  was shown to be strongly and negatively correlated to the POM-C fraction but not  
114 to the respired-C fraction (Soucémariadin et al. 2018).  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$  could thus be used as an  
115 indicator of the labile SOC pool defined above, similarly to the POM-C fraction. Another  
116 RE6-derived parameter, the temperature at which 50% of the  $CO_2$  resulting from SOM  
117 thermal oxidation has evolved ( $T_{50\_CO_2\_OX}$ ) was positively related to an increasing proportion  
118 of persistent SOC (Barré et al. 2016; Cécillon et al. 2018) and to a POM-C depletion in  
119 temperate forest soils (Soucémariadin et al. 2018).  $T_{50\_CO_2\_OX}$  could thus be used as an  
120 indicator of the stable SOC pool with mean residence times greater than several decades (>  
121 50–100 years; Cécillon et al. 2018).

122 Few studies have assessed the factors controlling SOC stability over large areas. Several  
123 recent studies have highlighted the importance of parent material and soil type on SOC  
124 content and stability, SOC in deep soil layers being generally more stable compared to surface  
125 SOC (Barré et al. 2017; Mason et al. 2016; Mathieu et al. 2015; Mulder et al. 2015). Camino-  
126 Serrano et al. (2014) reported a larger highly labile SOC pool (based on concentrations of  
127 dissolved organic carbon; DOC) in soils types characterized by a very acidic pH than in more  
128 basic soils, especially in the subsoil layers below 20 cm depth. Considering croplands and  
129 grasslands in Germany, Vos et al. (2017) showed that sandy soils had a larger labile SOC pool  
130 (POM-C fraction) than soils with finer texture.

131 Land cover and vegetation type have also been shown to strongly control SOC stability.  
132 Wiesmeier et al. (2014) found lower proportions of stable SOC pool in Bavarian forests  
133 compared to grasslands or croplands, confirming results across Europe that showed that  
134 afforestation of cropland and grassland generally decreased SOC stability (Poeplau and Don  
135 2013). In the temperate forests of Bavaria, vegetation type was also shown to control SOC  
136 stability, coniferous forests having higher labile SOC proportions than deciduous and mixed  
137 forests (Wiesmeier et al. 2014). Similar results were obtained for the highly labile SOC pool  
138 with lower dissolved organic carbon concentrations in broadleaved forests than coniferous  
139 forests (Camino-Serrano et al. 2014). Variations of soil respiration were also observed at the  
140 species level (*e.g.*, three species of oaks; You et al. 2016).

141 Regarding climate, both global and more local studies have highlighted the strong positive  
142 relationship with precipitation and the negative effect of temperature on SOC quantity  
143 (Jobbágy and Jackson, 2000; Paul et al., 2002; Callesen et al., 2003; Wiesmeier et al. 2013).  
144 Labile OM and particularly the POM-C fraction, has been shown to dominate in soils located  
145 at higher elevations and experiencing colder mean annual temperatures (*e.g.*, Leifeld et al.  
146 2009; Sjögersten et al. 2011). Considering over 300 forested sites, higher DOC concentrations

147 (highly labile SOC pool) were found in temperate sites than boreal and tropical sites (Camino-  
148 Serrano et al. 2014). To the exception of the work of Wiesmeier et al. (2014), we are not  
149 aware of large scale studies that would consider both the highly labile, labile and stable SOC  
150 pools and devoted to forest soils, despite their large SOC stocks.

151 The objectives of the study were thus to assess the importance of various environmental  
152 factors, soil depth, soil class, vegetation type and climate class in controlling the stability of  
153 SOC in forest soils. To this purpose, we used a set of complementary techniques, namely the  
154 Rock-Eval 6 thermal analysis, POM separation by size and density and a laboratory 10-week  
155 incubation, and applied them to a large set of French forest soil samples that covers a large  
156 pedoclimatic variability, a wide tree species diversity and includes deep samples (up to 1  
157 meter).

158 We hypothesized that 1/ SOC stability would vary with depth with surface soil layers  
159 containing more labile SOC while deep soil layers would contain more stable SOC; 2/  
160 vegetation type would influence SOC stability mostly in surface soil layers (with higher rates  
161 of C input from plants), SOC being more labile in topsoils of coniferous forests; 3/ soil class  
162 would influence SOC stability mostly in medium/deep soil layers (below 20 cm); and 4/  
163 climate would influence SOC stability and SOC in mountainous plots would be more labile.

164

## 165 Material and methods

### 166 a. Sites and soil samples

167 We considered forest mineral soil samples from 53 permanent forest sites of the French  
168 national network for the long term monitoring of forest ecosystems (“RENECOFOR”),  
169 established in 1992 (Ulrich 1995) by the National Forest Service (ONF;  
170 <http://www.onf.fr/renecofor>) as a part of the European ICP-FORESTS (<http://icp-forests.net/>)  
171 level 2 network (Fig. 1a). Our selected sites are variable in terms of climate (continental



172 influence; oceanic influence; mountainous influence; with mean annual precipitation MAP  
173 and mean annual temperature MAT ranging between 703–1894 mm and 4.8–12.3 °C  
174 respectively for the 1971–2000 period), soil type with a class constituted of soils related to  
175 entic Podzols, another class constituted of eutric and epileptic Cambisols as well as Calcisols  
176 and a last class constituted of dystric and hyperdystric Cambisols (IUSS Working Group  
177 2015) and forest vegetation with coniferous [silver fir (*Abies alba* Mill.); Norway spruce  
178 (*Picea abies* (L.) H. Karst.); European larch (*Larix decidua* Mill.); Scots pine (*Pinus*  
179 *sylvestris* L.)] and deciduous [beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L.); sessile (*Quercus petraea* (Matt.)  
180 Liebl.) and/or pedunculate oaks (*Quercus robur* L.)] stands. Stands are even-aged.  
181 At each site, samples representing five soil layers were obtained (0–10 cm, 10–20 cm, 20–40  
182 cm, 40–80 cm and 80–100 cm; Fig. 1b). Samples of the first three top soil layers were  
183 collected, at each depth, as 5 (replicates; pooled together on site) × 5 (sub-plots) sampling  
184 points over the 5000 m<sup>2</sup> central plot, by progressively digging a 50 cm wide soil profile  
185 (Jonard et al. 2017; Ponette et al. 1997). This sampling campaign took place between 2007  
186 and 2012. Samples of the two deeper soil layers were taken from two soil pits located just  
187 outside the central plot and collected in 1994–1995 (Brêthes et al. 1997).  
188 Bulk soils were air-dried and stored in plastic buckets right after sampling. One liter of soil of  
189 each layer was retrieved for this study by isovolumetrically pooling the samples of the 5  
190 subplots (200 mL each) for the first three layers (0–40 cm) and the 2 faces of the 2 soil pits  
191 (250 mL each) for the two deepest layers (40–100 cm). The pooled samples were sieved at 2  
192 mm before analysis.

193

#### 194 b. Elemental analysis

195 Bulk < 2 mm-sieved soil samples were ground (< 250 µm; ultra-centrifugal mill ZM 200,  
196 Retsch GmbH) and organic carbon and total nitrogen concentrations were determined by dry

197 combustion with an elemental analyzer (CHN NA 1500, Carlo Elba). Samples with  
198 carbonates (total  $\text{CaCO}_3 = 3.5\text{--}835 \text{ g}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$ ) were first decarbonated following the same  
199 protocol as Harris et al. (2001). Briefly, 30 mg of ground samples were weighed in 5 mm  $\times$  9  
200 mm silver boats followed by the addition of 50  $\mu\text{L}$  of distilled water. The boats were put in a  
201 glass bell jar, next to a beaker containing 100 mL of concentrated HCl ( $12 \text{ mol}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ ). The air  
202 in the jar was evacuated and samples let to sit in this HCl-saturated atmosphere to allow the  
203 acid to dissolve water and hydrolyze the carbonates for 8 h. Then, the decarbonated samples  
204 were dried at 60 °C in the silver boats for at least 48 h. Silver boats were further placed in 10  
205 mm  $\times$  10 mm tin boats and analyzed for C and N.

206 POM fractions (see subsection d) were ground with a ball mill (mixer mill MM 200, Retsch  
207 GmbH) or a mortar and pestle when the sample mass was less than 0.05 g. Carbon  
208 concentration was determined as for the bulk soil.

209

#### 210 c. Respiration test

211 For each sample, 20 g of 2 mm-sieved soil were transferred in a 120 mL glass-flask and re-  
212 humected at pF 2.5 ( $-0.033 \text{ MPa}$ ), which had been previously determined using a 5 Bar  
213 pressure plate extractor (#1600, Soilmoisture Equipment Corp.). The flasks were fitted with  
214 aluminum seals with PTFE-faced silicone septa to allow for headspace gas sampling and  
215 placed inside an incubator (AE240 BIO EXPERT, Froilabo SAS) kept at 20 °C for 10 weeks  
216 following a two-week period pre-incubation to allow the samples microbial activity to  
217 stabilize (data not included).

218 Headspace gases were sampled at 1 to 2-week intervals during the 10-week incubation period  
219 and  $\text{CO}_2$  concentrations were determined using an Agilent 490 micro-gas chromatograph  
220 equipped with the OpenLAB Chromatography Data System EZChrom software.

221 When CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations had reached 2.5–3% or was expecting to do so before the next  
222 measurement, and/or when the cap had been pierced with the needle four times, flasks were  
223 opened and flushed with fresh and moist air to return CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations to ambient levels to  
224 avoid anoxia (while maintaining the moisture content), before returning them to the incubator.  
225 The CO<sub>2</sub> released during the incubation experiment was expressed as the cumulated soil  
226 microbial respiration rate (basal respiration) from the initial SOC content over the 10-week  
227 period, or the 10-week mineralizable SOC (respired-C) and reported as a percentage of total  
228 SOC to account for differences in the C content of the various layers and sites. Respired-C  
229 was used as indicator of the highly labile SOC pool with mean residence time below 1 year.

230

231 d. Particle size and density SOC fractionation

232 To isolate the particulate organic matter (POM) fraction, samples were first dried at 50 °C for  
233 24 h before weighing 25 g and transferred them in polyethylene (PE) 250 mL flasks. We then  
234 added 180 mL of 0.5% sodium hexametaphosphate solution and ten 5 mm-diameter glass beads  
235 before shaking the samples overnight (50 rpm; 16 h) on an overhead shaker (Reax 2,  
236 Heidolph). Samples were thoroughly rinsed over a 50- $\mu$ m mesh with deionized water. The  
237 sand fraction was then transferred back to a dry PE flask with a sodium polytungstate (SPT)  
238 solution of density =  $1.6 \pm 0.03 \text{ g}\cdot\text{cm}^{-3}$  (Crow et al. 2007; Golchin et al. 1994) and solution  
239 was added up to around 180 mL. The flasks were shaken overhead by hand 10 times and  
240 samples were left overnight to settle down after the cap of the flask was rinsed with the SPT  
241 solution. The floating material was collected with a spatula and placed over a 50- $\mu$ m mesh  
242 sieve. If necessary some SPT solution was added back to the flask and the previous step was  
243 repeated. This time, samples were placed in a centrifuge for 30 minutes to accelerate the  
244 separation (2750 rpm or 1250 g). The floating material was again collected with the spatula or  
245 pipetted depending on the amount left. This step was repeated if the light fraction was

246 abundant. If not, samples were left to settle down overnight before one last collection. The  
247 POM fraction on the sieve was thoroughly rinsed with deionized water throughout the whole  
248 process. The sieves and fractions were then placed in the oven at 50 °C for 24 h before being  
249 weighed. To account for differences in the C content of the different samples, we calculated  
250 the proportion of OC in the POM fraction (POM-C), expressed as a percentage of total SOC.  
251 POM-C was used as indicator of the labile SOC pool with mean residence time generally up  
252 to 20 years.

253

254 e. Thermal analysis: Rock-Eval 6

255 The thermal analysis of the samples was performed with a Rock-Eval 6 turbo device (Vinci  
256 Technologies, France). Details about the equipment have been previously published (Behar et  
257 al. 2001). We adapted the procedure developed for the analysis of SOM by Disnar et al.  
258 (2003). Briefly, about 60 mg of ground sample were exposed to two consecutive thermal  
259 treatments, first in a pyrolysis oven (200–650 °C; thermal ramping rate of 30 °C·min<sup>-1</sup>; under  
260 N<sub>2</sub> atmosphere) then in a combustion oven (300–850 °C; thermal ramping rate of  
261 20 °C·min<sup>-1</sup>; under laboratory air atmosphere). At the beginning of the pyrolysis, there was an  
262 isothermal step (at 200 °C) during ≈ 200 seconds during which the free hydrocarbons (HC)  
263 were thermovaporized (S1 peak). The pyrolysis effluents (mostly HC) were detected and  
264 quantified with flame ionization detection, while CO and CO<sub>2</sub> were quantified by infrared  
265 detection during both the pyrolysis and oxidation stages (Online Resource 1).

266 Two standard RE6 parameters describing SOC bulk chemistry were determined: the hydrogen  
267 and oxygen indices (HI and OI<sub>RE6</sub>). The HI index corresponds to the amount of hydrocarbons  
268 formed during thermal pyrolysis of the sample (HC evolved between 200 and 650 °C minus  
269 the S1 peak) divided by the total SOC content of the sample and is expressed in mg HC·g<sup>-1</sup>  
270 SOC. It describes the relative enrichment/depletion of SOC in hydrogen-rich moieties. The

271  $OI_{RE6}$  index describes the relative oxidation status of SOC. It was calculated using the  
272 equation proposed by Lafargue et al. (1998):

$$273 \quad OI_{RE6} = 16 / 28 \times OI_{CO} + 32 / 44 \times OI_{CO2} \quad (\text{equation 3})$$

274 Where  $OI_{CO2}$  corresponds to the  $CO_2$  yielded during thermal pyrolysis of the sample between  
275 200 and 400 °C divided by the total SOC of the sample and  $OI_{CO}$  corresponds to the CO  
276 yielded during thermal pyrolysis between 200 and 400–650 °C (wherever a minimum of CO  
277 production is observed; in the absence of a minimum, the default upper-limit temperature is  
278 set at 550 °C) divided by the total SOC of the sample. Thus  $OI_{RE6}$  is expressed in  $mg \ O_2 \cdot g^{-1}$   
279 SOC.

280 We derived two additional RE6 parameter describing the thermal stability of SOC: (i)  
281  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$ , the temperature at which 50% of the HC resulting from the SOM pyrolysis had  
282 evolved and (ii)  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$ , the temperature at which 50% of the  $CO_2$  resulting from the SOM  
283 oxidation had evolved. The upper limit temperature for the integration of this signal was set at  
284 611 °C to obtain a total  $CO_2$  signal evolved from pure OM without interference of carbonates.  
285  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$  was used as an indicator of the labile SOC pool with mean residence time  
286 generally up to 20 years (negative correlation with the labile SOC pool according to  
287 Gregorich et al. (2015) and Soucémariadin et al. (2018)), while  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  was used as an  
288 indicator of the stable SOC pool with mean residence time typically greater than 50–100  
289 years, following Barré et al. (2016) and Cécillon et al. (2018). Signal processing of the RE6  
290 thermograms, *i.e.*, signal integration and calculation of  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$  and  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$ , was  
291 performed with the R environment software v.3.3 (R Core Team 2016) using the hyperSpec  
292 (Beleites and Sergio 2015) and pracma (Borchers 2015) R packages.

293

294 f. Calculations and statistical analyses

295 For the respiration test, samples with very low C content ( $< 0.2\%$ ) were not considered as the  
296 C respired during the incubation period was too close to the limit of detection for reliable  
297 determination. For the thermal analysis, we used a C content threshold of  $0.1\%$  and manually  
298 inspected the pyrolysis thermograms for samples with  $0.1\% \leq \text{C content} \leq 0.25\%$  to make  
299 sure of the validity of the RE6 data (by assessing the shape of the signal). This resulted in the  
300 selection of  $n = 46 / 50$  and  $n = 31 / 33$  samples for the soil layers 40–80 cm and 80–100 cm  
301 and the two methods respectively, leading to a total  $n = 236$  for respiration test and  $n = 242$   
302 for RE6 (Fig. 1b). Because POM fractionation is time-consuming, we analyzed only the soil  
303 layers 0–10 cm and 40–80 cm (Fig. 1b). At two sites, soil was too shallow ( $< 40$  cm) and no  
304 sample was therefore collected for the 40–80 cm layer, and we used the same C threshold as  
305 for the RE6 to select the POM samples, which lead to  $n = 103$ . Out of the 236 samples  
306 considered for the respiration test, 35 had a  $\text{CaCO}_3$  content over 5% (5.2–82.0%). We tested  
307 the correlation between respired-C and  $\text{CaCO}_3$  content and, as it was not significant, decided  
308 to proceed with the statistical analysis with all the samples.

309 Basic soil parameters (pH, texture, cation exchange capacity) were previously published in  
310 Ponette et al. (1997). Average values are reported in Table 1 as well as the C content and C/N  
311 ratio measured on the composite samples from this study. Because we used isovolumetric  
312 pooled sampled, we saw appropriate to use average values of the 5 replicates  $\times$  5 sub-plots.  
313 This was confirmed by the results we obtained for the C content (Online Resource 2).  
314 Relationships between the indicators of SOC stability and soil physico-chemical properties as  
315 well as climatic data (MAT and MAP) were estimated using Spearman rank correlation as the  
316 data did not meet the assumption of normality. Correlations were also performed on different  
317 sets of samples for the different indicators (233 samples were included for the respiration test,  
318 242 for the RE6 comparison and 103 for the POM fractionation).

319 A principal component of analysis (PCA) was performed to illustrate linear relations between  
320 the indicators derived from the 3 methods at two different depths: 0–10 cm and 40–80 cm.  
321 For that purpose, data were log-transformed, centred and scaled. To determine the number of  
322 principal components to select, we looked at the percentage of the total variance explained  
323 and used a scree plot and Kaiser’s criterion. We projected the physico-chemical and climatic  
324 variables on the circle of correlations to see if any of those was associated with either of the  
325 principal components and could thus be associated with SOC stability.

326 The statistical analysis to determine the driving factors of SOC stability was performed in two  
327 steps: first over the complete soil profile and then on each soil layer individually. We used  
328 multivariate models to assess the effects of the different environmental factors on the RE6-  
329 based parameters and respiration test and POM fractionation results. For this “analysis by soil  
330 profile”, we used linear mixed models introducing a random intercept for each site ( $\approx$  to treat  
331 “site” as random effect) to take into account that the different layers constituted repeated  
332 measures (increasing depth within a same RENECOFOR site). To do so we added the  
333 compound symmetry structure, which is similar to the variance structure of random-intercept-  
334 only model, to a generalized least squares function (that fits a linear model using generalized  
335 least squares; (Pinheiro et al. 2016)). Model selection was then implemented with a top-down  
336 strategy. The response variables were transformed, to the exception of T<sub>50\_HC\_PYR</sub> and  
337 T<sub>50\_CO2\_OX</sub>, using the Box-Cox transformation technique ( $\log_{10}$  for POM-C and (respired-C +  
338 1)), as they showed evidence of the variance increasing with the mean response. After  
339 transformation, the residuals followed an approximate normal distribution.

340 To explore further the effects of soil classes, vegetation types and climatic zones within each  
341 layer, we then conducted three-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) “by layer” with type II  
342 analysis, when the interactions were not significant. Data were not transformed except for  
343 respired-C. Multiple comparison tests were performed with Tukey's honest significant

344 differences (to get adjusted  $p$ -values for all comparisons) and pairwise t-test (no adjustment  
345 method). All comparisons were considered significant at an alpha value ( $\alpha$ ) of 0.05.  
346 All statistical analyses were performed using the R 3.3 statistical software (R Core Team  
347 2016) with the factoextra (Kassambara and Mundt 2016), nlme (Pinheiro et al. 2016), lme4  
348 (Bates et al. 2015) and car (Fox and Weisberg 2011) packages.

349

## 350 Results

### 351 a. Highly labile SOC pool: respired-C

352 Depth and soil class significantly influenced variations in soil basal respiration (respired-C)  
353 across our 53 study plots. The depth  $\times$  soil interaction was also included in the selected model  
354 ( $p = 0.042$ ; Online Resource 3). The respired-C fraction was on average  $1.46 \pm 0.63\%$  of total  
355 SOC (Online Resource 4) with no significant differences among vegetation types (Fig. 3) or  
356 climatic zones (Table 2). Respired-C decreased with depth (Fig. 2) but that factor was only  
357 marginally significant. Soil class was not significant in the 40–80 cm layer but otherwise entic  
358 Podzols had significantly lower respired-C than the two other soil classes ( $p = 0.0010$ – $0.042$ ;  
359 Table 2; Fig. 4).

360

### 361 b. Labile SOC pool: POM-C and $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$

362 Only depth and soil type significantly affected variations in POM-C across our 53 study plots  
363 (Online Resource 3). The labile SOC fraction contained in POM decreased by almost half  
364 from the 0–10 cm layer to the 40–80 cm layer (with respective proportions of  $22.6 \pm 7.3\%$  and  
365  $11.5 \pm 6.2\%$  of total SOC; Fig. 2). The analysis by layer confirmed that neither climate nor  
366 vegetation significantly influenced POM-C variations (Table 2; Fig. 3). Eutric Cambisols had



367 significantly less POM-C than entic Podzols in the surface layer and dystric Cambisols at 40–  
368 80 cm (Fig. 4; Online Resource 4).

369 Depth, vegetation type and soil class influenced variations in  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$ , the RE6-derived  
370 temperature at which 50% of the HC resulting from the SOM pyrolysis had evolved. The  
371 three interactions depth  $\times$  soil, depth  $\times$  veg and soil  $\times$  veg were also included in the selected  
372 model (Online Resource 3).  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$  significantly increased with depth ( $422 \pm 8$  to  $452 \pm$   
373  $13$  °C at 0–10 cm and 80–100 cm, respectively; Fig. 2), illustrating the decrease of the labile  
374 SOC pool with increasing depth. Eutric Cambisols had significantly higher  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$  than  
375 dystric Cambisols and entic Podzols in the surface layer but had significantly lower  
376  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$  than the two other soil classes at 20–40 cm depth (Fig. 4; Online Resource 4).  
377 Moreover, in the surface layer, samples in deciduous plots had a significantly higher  
378  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$  than those in coniferous plots ( $427 \pm 9$  and  $417 \pm 7$  °C, respectively,  $p < 0.001$ ;  
379 Table 2; Fig. 3).

380

381 c. Stable SOC pool:  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$

382 Depth, vegetation and climate induced significant variations in the temperature at which 50%  
383 of the CO<sub>2</sub> resulting from the SOM oxidation had evolved ( $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$ ) across our 53 study  
384 plots. The depth  $\times$  climate interaction was also included in the selected model (Online  
385 Resource 3).

386  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  increased with depth (from  $399 \pm 9$  to  $437 \pm 19$  °C at 0–10 cm and 80–100 cm,  
387 respectively; Fig. 2). Vegetation type was significant only in the top soil layers (0–40 cm)  
388 with samples from coniferous plots having a lower  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  than those in deciduous plots  
389 ( $395 \pm 6$  °C and  $405 \pm 9$  °C, respectively; Fig. 3). Soil class was a significant factor both in  
390 layers 0–10 cm ( $p = 0.0085$ ) and 40–80 cm ( $p = 0.0489$ ; Table 2) but with contrasting trend:  
391 in the surface layer, eutric Cambisols had the highest  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  (significantly higher than

392 entic Podzols) and the lowest  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  in the 40–80 cm layer (significantly lower than the  
393 dystric Cambisols; Fig. 4; Online Resource 4). Climate was a significant factor in all layers:  
394 over the whole profile (0–100 cm),  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  was lower in mountainous plots than in plots  
395 located in the two other climate classes ( $p \leq 0.0001$ – $0.0159$ ; Table 2; Fig. 5).

396

397 d. Correlations between soil and climate characteristics and the indicators of SOC stability  
398 There were only a few significant and strong correlations between the indicators of SOC  
399 stability and soil physico-chemical properties (Table 3). Notably POM-C and  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$ , the  
400 two indicators of the labile SOC pool, had strong and opposite correlations with HI ( $\rho = 0.67$   
401 and  $-0.67$  respectively) and  $OI_{RE6}$  ( $\rho = -0.76$  and  $0.63$  respectively). POM-C was also  
402 positively correlated with C/N ratio ( $\rho = 0.61$ ).  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  was negatively correlated to the C  
403 content ( $\rho = -0.72$ ; Table 3). Respired-C showed no strong correlation with soil or climate  
404 characteristics. In our samples we observed no strong correlation for the four indicators of  
405 SOC stability with soil texture, pH (although  $\rho = -0.54$  with POM-C) or the climatic  
406 characteristics (MAT or MAP; Table 3).

407 Because of the strong “depth effect” on each indicator of SOC stability, we explored the  
408 evolution of these correlations within each soil layer and noticed that they also evolved with  
409 depth (Online Resource 5). To describe the similarity or dissimilarity in the different  
410 indicators of SOC lability, we conducted a principal component analysis (PCA) at the two  
411 depths for which POM-C was available (0–10 and 40–80 cm). In the 0–10 cm layer, the first  
412 two principal components (PC) explained almost 60% of the total variance (Fig. 6). PC1  
413 clearly separated soil samples dominated by highly labile SOC pool from those dominated by  
414 labile SOC pool associated with POM-C. Indeed, along PC1, POM-C and respired-C showed  
415 moderate to strong negative and positive loadings respectively, while  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  had moderate  
416 positive loadings (Fig. 6).  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$  showed strong negative loadings along PC2, while it had

417 very weak negative loadings along PC1. Results were quite different in the 40–80 cm layer,  
418 where the first two principal components (PC) explained approximately 63% of the total  
419 variance (Fig. 6). In these deeper samples, PC1 tightly grouped soil samples with high  
420 proportion of highly labile SOC pool (respired-C) and those with high proportion of labile  
421 SOC pool associated with POM-C with strong positive loadings for both indicators along  
422 PC1.  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  and  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$  had both strong positive loadings along PC2, while they had  
423 very weak loadings along PC1.

424 SOC content was not related to any of the indicators of SOC stability in the surface layer,  
425 while it was moderately and negatively correlated with POM-C, respired-C and  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  in  
426 the deep layer (Fig. 6; Online Resource 5). In the surface layer, pH was associated with  
427 positive values on the first PC (high respired-C), while sand content and soil C/N ratio were  
428 associated with negative values on the first PC (high POM-C; Fig. 6; Online Resource 5). HI  
429 and  $OI_{RE6}$  were well correlated to the indicators of highly labile and labile SOC pools,  
430 specifically in the surface layer. Correlations of the physico-chemical variables with POM-C  
431 were slightly lower at depth (Online Resource 5), but below 20 cm depth, all these  
432 correlations with  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$  and respired-C (directly with the indicators or with the PCs) had  
433 greatly decreased or even disappeared (Online Resource 5). Conversely,  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  was not  
434 more than weakly correlated with the physico-chemical parameters over the whole profile but  
435 its positive correlation with MAT tended to be higher in deeper layers (Online Resource 5;  
436 Fig.6).

437 The PCA biplot displaying the samples based on their soil class (Fig. 6) showed a difference  
438 between eutric Cambisol and entic Podzol with the two first PCs in the surface layer (0–10  
439 cm): samples of eutric Cambisols had higher respired-C, lower POM-C and generally higher  
440  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$  and  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  than those of entic Podzols.

441 In the deep layer (40–80 cm), the two PCs separated samples of dystric Cambisols from  
442 samples of eutric Cambisols. The former were mostly characterized by high respired-C and  
443 POM-C values and high values of T<sub>50\_HC\_PYR</sub> and T<sub>50\_CO2\_OX</sub>. The latter had either high values  
444 of T<sub>50\_HC\_PYR</sub> and T<sub>50\_CO2\_OX</sub> with low respired-C and POM-C or low values of T<sub>50\_HC\_PYR</sub> and  
445 T<sub>50\_CO2\_OX</sub> with high respired-C and POM-C. The second PC separated samples that had more  
446 stable SOC (high values on PC2) from those that had less stable SOC (low values on PC2).  
447 Dystric Cambisols thus appeared as having more stable SOC than the two other soil classes  
448 (Fig. 6).

449

## 450 Discussion

### 451 a. Depth is the most discriminating factor of SOC stability

452 In our study sites, depth was the most discriminating factor, affecting significantly all  
453 indicators of SOC stability. Indeed, with depth, we observed consistent trends for the  
454 indicators of the highly-labile (decrease of respired-C) and the labile (decrease of POM-C and  
455 increase of T<sub>50\_HC\_PYR</sub>) SOC pools, and an opposite trend for the indicator of the stable SOC  
456 pool (increase of T<sub>50\_CO2\_OX</sub>), verifying our first hypothesis.

457 Studies have shown a decrease in POM-C (% of total SOC) with increasing depth down to  
458 20–30 cm (Hassink 1995; Schrumpf and Kaiser 2015), down to 50 cm (Diochon and Kellman  
459 2009) or down to > 140 cm (Cardinael et al. 2015; Moni et al. 2010). Previous studies have  
460 also reported decreasing respired-C with depth during incubations of variable duration (*e.g.*,  
461 Dodla et al. 2012; Gillespie et al. 2014; Schrumpf et al. 2013; Wang and Zhong 2016 with 12  
462 days at 22.5 °C, 20 days at 15 °C, 98 days at 25 °C, 60 days at 25 °C, respectively).

463 Variations in soil basal respiration with depth have been related with variations in C dynamics  
464 (*e.g.*, Agnelli et al. 2004; Salomé et al. 2010; Wordell-Dietrich et al. 2017).

465 Labile SOC content usually decreases while stable SOC increases with depth (*e.g.*, Jenkinson  
466 et al. 2008; Lorenz and Lal 2005; Mathieu et al. 2015) and this is correlated with longer SOC  
467 turnover rates as exemplified by Torn et al. (1997) and Mathieu et al. (2015) who showed  
468 strong effects of depth on SOC mean age.

469

470 b. Soil class as a major factor controlling SOC stability

471 Soil class had significant effects on the indicators of the highly-labile (respired-C) and labile  
472 (POM-C and T<sub>50\_HC\_PYR</sub>) SOC pools. Contrary to our third hypothesis, these soil effects were  
473 not limited to the deeper layers and were indeed present in the surface layer for all four  
474 indicators of SOC stability (Table 2).

475 i) Modulation of the effect of depth by soil class

476 The effect of depth on SOC stability, *i.e.* the decrease of the labile SOC and concomitant  
477 increase in stable SOC was modulated by the soil class. First, the surface (0-10 cm) values of  
478 all SOC stability parameters varied among soil classes (Table 2; Fig. 4), surface layers of  
479 eutric Cambisols being generally enriched in stable SOC compared to other soil classes. This  
480 might be explained by a relative higher stabilization of SOC in the surface layer of the eutric  
481 Cambisols that could be due to a faster cycling in relation to lower C/N ratios ( $13.2 \pm 1.5$  vs.  
482  $18.4 \pm 4.5$  for the other two classes) and higher pH ( $6.2 \pm 0.9$  vs.  $4.3 \pm 0.3$  for the other two  
483 classes), stimulating the mineralization of the more labile SOC and resulting in a more stable  
484 SOC overall. SOC stabilisation through Ca-mediated processes (occlusion, inclusion,  
485 sorption; Rowley et al., 2018) may also explain the higher SOC stability in surface layers of  
486 eutric Cambisols.

487 Then the amplitude of the evolution of SOC stability with depth varied among soil classes  
488 (Figure 4). Thus, the higher stability observed in the surface layer of eutric Cambisols had  
489 disappeared by 20–40 cm depth. This modulation of the effect of depth by soil class could be

490 linked to different types of SOM moieties developed by very different pedogenetic processes,  
491 eutric Cambisols showing a relatively more oxidized SOC than other soil classes (higher  
492  $OI_{RE6}$ ; specifically down to 40 cm depth). In the deep layer, dystric Cambisols were  
493 characterized by high  $OI_{RE6}$  values, which could be linked to larger stable SOC pools in this  
494 soil class, likely associated with more oxidized SOC moieties (Cécillon et al., 2018).  
495 Lastly, in our sites, soil class did not significantly affect the indicator of stable SOC  
496 ( $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$ ; at least not for the whole profile model), and the stable SOC pool appeared  
497 mostly driven by differences in MAT (specifically at depth; Fig 6; see section d. of the  
498 Discussion). This result is seemingly contradictory to the findings of Mathieu et al. (2015)  
499 who reported a strong influence of soil type on deep soil mean carbon age. It should be noted  
500 that these authors covered a greater soil variability in their study and if we focus on the 3 soil  
501 classes considered in our work, their results are similar to ours (*i.e.*, no large difference among  
502 the three soil classes).

503 ii) Soil variables explaining the pedological effect on SOC stability

504 Soil type is not often used as an explanatory factor of variations in SOC quality/stability (*e.g.*,  
505 Wiesmeier et al. 2014) and physico-chemical properties (*e.g.*, clay content, pH, etc.) are often  
506 preferred (*e.g.*, Tian et al. 2016). We thus wondered whether a series of physico-chemical  
507 parameters could have summarized the soil class effect on SOC stability.

508 The effect of soil type on the highly-labile and labile SOC pools may be due to differences in  
509 soil texture (sand content), pH or C/N ratio (Online Resource 6, Fig. 6). Indeed, a strong  
510 effect of soil texture on SOC stability in the topsoil (0–10 cm) has previously been reported in  
511 the literature. For instance, just like we did (POM-C in coarse-textured entic Podzols =  $25.1 \pm$   
512  $7.6\%$  vs.  $19.2 \pm 5.6\%$  in fine-textured eutric Cambisols; Fig. 4; Online Resource 4), several  
513 studies have observed a trend of more labile SOC (expressed as POM-C or size of the

514 intermediate SOC pool) in coarser soils (Schiedung et al. 2017; Wiesmeier et al. 2014) or  
515 directly linked to the sand fraction (Tian et al. 2016; Vos et al. 2017).

516 In our sites, respired-C was higher in fine-textured soils up to 40 cm depth and was  
517 significantly lower in Podzols. Conversely, several studies have reported higher C  
518 mineralization rates in sandy soils than in finer-textured soils in various contexts from boreal  
519 forests through croplands in Norway and all the way to Brazil (Bauhus et al. 1998; Frøseth  
520 and Bleken 2015; Schmatz et al. 2017). These opposite results could originate from various  
521 sources, and specifically differences in C/N ratio. For our sites, the topsoil C/N ratio in eutric  
522 Cambisols was significantly lower ( $13.3 \pm 1.5$ ) than in entic Podzols ( $19.9 \pm 5$ ; Online  
523 Resource 4), which could affect the microbial use efficiency during the incubation (*e.g.*,  
524 Cotrufo et al. 1995). Differences in pH could be another good explanation. Our entic Podzols  
525 and eutric Cambisols had lower and higher pH than the till ( $\approx$  sandy) and clay soils from the  
526 Bauhus et al. (1998) study, respectively. It has been shown that a slight increase in pH could  
527 significantly increase rates of mineralization (Curtin et al. 1998).

528 All these physico-chemical variables reflect the importance of SOM stoichiometry (C/N ratio)  
529 (Ågren et al. 2013; Cleveland and Liptzin 2007) and substrate accessibility (reduced  
530 protection via aggregation in sandy soils or increase in dissolved OM with higher pH) for its  
531 degradation (Dungait et al. 2012; Schmidt et al. 2011). However the lack of or low to  
532 moderate correlations between the different indicators of SOC stability and these soil physico-  
533 chemical parameters (texture and pH respectively; Table 3) suggest that there is not one  
534 characteristics only responsible for the soil effect we observed or that, at least, they are not  
535 valid at all depths of the soil profile as we have shown (Online Resource 5; Fig. 6). There are  
536 likely complex interactions, reflecting pedogenetic processes behind this and, in that regard,  
537 the soil class is integrative and goes beyond simple soil physico-chemical characteristics, and  
538 is thus capable of reflecting variations in SOC stability.

539

540 c. Vegetation type mostly affects SOC stability in topsoils

541 In our study sites, the effect of vegetation type (coniferous forest vs. deciduous forest) on  
542 SOC stability was concentrated on the surface layer (0–10 cm), thus validating part of our  
543 second hypothesis. Vegetation type significantly influenced both thermal indicators of SOC  
544 stability in surface soil layers while the classical indicators of the highly labile (respired-C)  
545 and the labile (POM-C) SOC pools were not affected by vegetation.

546 Effects of vegetation on the labile SOC pool have been previously reported, but they were  
547 mainly observed at the tree species level (Bauhus et al. 1998; Augusto et al. 2002; Hobbie et  
548 al. 2007; Olsen and Van Miegroet 2010; Laganière et al. 2012; Vesterdal et al. 2012; You et  
549 al. 2016). Conversely, previous studies have also reported a lack of difference in the highly  
550 labile SOC pool (estimated by respired-C) of topsoils in deciduous and coniferous stands  
551 (Fissore et al. 2008; Van Miegroet et al. 2005).

552 In our study sites, the surface layer (0–10 cm) of coniferous stands had more labile SOC  
553 (lower  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$ ) but also less stable SOC (lower  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$ ) than in deciduous stands,  
554 validating the second part of our second hypothesis. Similar findings were reported in  
555 Bavarian forests, where deciduous and mixed stands showed smaller labile SOC and larger  
556 stable SOC pools than coniferous stands (Wiesmeier et al. 2014).

557 Deciduous forests indeed tend to rely on a more rapid nutrient cycling between soil and plant  
558 (Cole and Rapp 1981). Quideau et al. (2001) showed that oak-derived SOM has undergone  
559 extensive oxidation compared with the litter, while SOM under coniferous vegetation became  
560 enriched in recalcitrant alkyl C. The authors conclude that deciduous stands were  
561 characterized by a high microbial activity and rapid nutrient release whereas the accumulated  
562 SOM in coniferous forests had a low bioavailability. The higher pH values of the litter in  
563 deciduous stands favour bioturbation and incorporation of OM in surface mineral soil,  
564 whereas the more acidic coniferous litter accumulates in the organic layers (*e.g.*, Wiesmeier et



565 al. 2013). These results could also be explained by lower C/N ratios in deciduous plots (*e.g.*,  
566 Cools et al. 2014). C/N ratio in deciduous stands ( $15.0 \pm 2.8$ ) were indeed lower than in  
567 topsoils under coniferous ( $18.4 \pm 5.1$ ) and closer to that of the microbial biomass. This  
568 difference in C/N ratios between the two vegetation types was more drastic when considering  
569 the plant inputs (deciduous =  $46.5 \pm 9.5$ ; coniferous =  $60.9 \pm 16.8$ ; data not shown) and high  
570 C/N ratios in litter are often associated with low decomposition rates (Melillo et al. 1982;  
571 Norby et al. 2001; Tian et al. 2016). This would result in a higher litter mineralization  
572 potential in deciduous stands and because the highly labile/labile pool is utilized more readily  
573 in these plots (higher litter C turnover), it would result in a smaller size of the labile pool in  
574 deciduous stands and thus a higher  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$ . Indeed, there was a negative and moderate  
575 correlation between  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$  and the inputs C/N ratio, but only in the top layer (Online  
576 Resource 5). In the long term, the low C/N ratio of the deciduous litters could also explain the  
577 higher  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  through higher SOC stabilization (Berg 2000). This highlights the  
578 importance of the bulk chemistry of SOC inputs (Hobbie et al. 2007; You et al. 2016) for  
579 SOC cycling. This difference in SOC stability (in the mineral soil) between the two  
580 vegetation types has also been mentioned in the review by Augusto et al. (2015) and the  
581 reasons of this difference identified as a future research need.

582 The limited effect of vegetation types in our study sites could be linked to species  
583 heterogeneity within the two vegetation types and this might be an important limitation of this  
584 work. We chose to consider vegetation types and not tree species to obtain a more balanced  
585 design (29 plots in coniferous stands and 24 in deciduous stands; Fig. 1a) and our deciduous  
586 stands included both beech and oak-dominated forests. Inter-species variations in terms of  
587 their characteristics (*e.g.*, aboveground litter composition; roots) and their effects on the soil  
588 could explain, at least partially, the limited effects of the (broad) vegetation classes in this  
589 study. Some studies have indeed reported an effect of tree species on both *in-situ* and

590 laboratory soil respiration rates (measured over a year) (Hobbie et al. 2007; Vesterdal et al.  
591 2012). In oak stands, the respiration rate was greater than in beech stands, but similar to those  
592 in spruce stands, illustrating that the deciduous/coniferous dichotomy might be masking some  
593 species effects, at least on the labile SOC pool, but quite likely also on the stable SOC pool.

594

595 d. Climatic control of the stable SOC pool

596 In our study, climate effects on SOC stability were concentrated on the stable SOC pool. Soils  
597 located in plots with mountainous climate had higher C content (data not shown) than those in  
598 plots in regions with oceanic or continental influence. However this higher concentration was  
599 not associated with climate effects on the labile SOC indicators. Nevertheless climate was a  
600 strong driver of the stable SOC indicator, SOC being less stable (lower  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$ ) in  
601 mountainous plots. Our last hypothesis (SOC in mountainous plots would be more labile) was  
602 thus only partially verified.

603 In Bavarian forests (Wiesmeier et al. 2014), the passive SOC pool (roughly equivalent to our  
604 stable SOC pool) was negatively related to MAP, which agrees with our results as the  
605 mountainous plots were the wettest ( $1323 \pm 297$  mm) and there were negative correlations  
606 between MAP and  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  in almost all layers (Online Resource 5). However, unlike us,  
607 Wiesmeier et al. (2014) also detected a strong climate effect on the labile SOC as the latter  
608 was under the control of both temperature and precipitation, and the most labile SOC was  
609 found in mountainous regions. Similarly, Meier and Leuschner (2010) reported more labile  
610 SOC when temperature decreased and precipitation increased, while Leifeld et al. (2009)  
611 reported more POM-C at higher elevation in grasslands. In our study sites, there were no  
612 more than weak correlations between our labile SOC pools and MAT and MAP, even when  
613 considering individual layers (Online Resource 5). Nevertheless, it should be noted that the  
614 mean elevation of our mountainous plots was 1230 m ( $\pm 280$  m) while Leifeld et al. (2009)

615 had 5 out of their 8 sites located at  $\geq 1410$  m elevation. Finally, this “high elevation” effect on  
616 the labile fraction, expressed as POM-C requires caution as, in mountainous regions, lower  
617 MAT tend to reduce microbial activity thus favouring SOC accumulation (*e.g.*, Tewksbury  
618 and Van Miegroet 2007), even in tropical areas (Araujo et al. 2017). In cold environments, the  
619 residence time of this “labile” (as very close to the litter inputs) SOC is much longer than in  
620 more temperate climate (Leifeld et al. 2009). In that particular context, the relationship  
621 between thermal stability and SOC residence time/turnover may also be questioned and  
622 requires further study.

623 Another possible limitation of the present study is that vegetation and climate appeared to be  
624 confounded factors in our design with coniferous plots being preferentially found in  
625 mountainous regions: our coniferous plots had a mean elevation of 831 m ( $\pm 476$  m) while it  
626 was 511 m ( $\pm 413$  m) in the deciduous plots. This had an incidence on the MAT especially  
627 (Online Resource 6).

628

629

## 630 Conclusions

631 In this study, thanks to a large set of forest soil samples with contrasted SOC stability and the  
632 use of several indicators, we were able to highlight the influence of four environmental factors  
633 on SOC stability: depth, soil, vegetation and climate; with the degree of significance of these  
634 factors (and their interactions) varying among the SOC pools.

635 Our results show that pedology is a discriminant factor of SOC stability, more than individual  
636 soil physico-chemical attributes. Soil type constitutes an integrated parameter that might be an  
637 efficient way to capture SOC turnover properties. Upon modification in land management that  
638 would result in a decrease of C inputs to the soil, our results let suggest that the SOC of eutric

639 Cambisols may be less sensitive than the one of dystric Cambisols but specifically of entic  
640 Podzols that may be more prone to losses.

641 To conclude, soil class, vegetation type and climatic zone all had a significant influence on  
642 SOC stability at various depths in our studied French forest soils and these environmental  
643 factors should thus be included in models estimating the ecosystem service of climate  
644 regulation.

645

646

## 647 Acknowledgements

648 This work was supported by the French Environment and Energy Management Agency  
649 (ADEME) [APR REACTIF, piCaSo project] and Campus France [PRESTIGE-2015-3-  
650 0008]. We thank M. Bryant, S. Cecchini, J. Mériguet, F. Savignac, and L. Le Vagueresse for  
651 their technical support.

652

## 653 References

654 Agnelli A, Ascher J, Corti G, Ceccherini MT, Nannipieri P, Pietramellara G (2004)  
655 Distribution of microbial communities in a forest soil profile investigated by microbial  
656 biomass, soil respiration and DGGE of total and extracellular DNA. *Soil Biol Biochem.* doi:  
657 10.1016/j.soilbio.2004.02.004

658 Ågren GI, Hyvönen R, Berglund SL, Hobbie SE (2013) Estimating the critical N:C from  
659 litter decomposition data and its relation to soil organic matter stoichiometry. *Soil Biol*  
660 *Biochem.* doi: 10.1016/j.soilbio.2013.09.010

661 Amundson R (2001) The Carbon Budget in Soils. *Annu Rev Earth Planet Sci* 29:535-562.  
662 doi: 10.1146/annurev.earth.29.1.535

663 Araujo MA, Zinn YL, Lal R (2017) Soil parent material, texture and oxide contents have  
664 little effect on soil organic carbon retention in tropical highlands. *Geoderma*. doi:  
665 10.1016/j.geoderma.2017.04.006

666 Augusto L, Ranger J, Binkley D, Rothe A (2002) Impact of several common tree species of  
667 European temperate forests on soil fertility. *Ann For Sci* 59:233-253

668 Augusto L, De Schrijver A, Vesterdal L, Smolander A, Prescott C, Ranger J (2015)  
669 Influences of evergreen gymnosperm and deciduous angiosperm tree species on the  
670 functioning of temperate and boreal forests. *Biol Rev* 90:444-466. doi: 10.1111/brv.12119

671 Balesdent J (1996) The significance of organic separates to carbon dynamics and its  
672 modelling in some cultivated soils. *Eur J Soil Sci* 47:485-493. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-  
673 2389.1996.tb01848.x

674 Barré P, Durand H, Chenu C, Meunier P, Montagne D, Castel G, Billiou D,  
675 Soucémariadin L, Cécillon L (2017) Geological control of soil organic carbon and nitrogen  
676 stocks at the landscape scale. *Geoderma* 285:50-56. doi: 10.1016/j.geoderma.2016.09.029

677 Barré P, Plante AF, Cécillon L, Lutfalla S, Baudin F, Christensen BT, Eglin T, Fernandez  
678 JM, Houot S, Kätterer T, Le Guillou C, Macdonald A, van Oort F, Chenu C (2016) The  
679 energetic and chemical signatures of persistent soil organic matter. *Biogeochemistry* 130:1-  
680 12. doi: 10.1007/s10533-016-0246-0

681 Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S (2015) Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models  
682 Using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software, Articles* 67:1-48

683 Bausch J, Paré D, Côté L (1998) Effects of tree species, stand age and soil type on soil  
684 microbial biomass and its activity in a southern boreal forest. *Soil Biol Biochem*. doi:  
685 10.1016/S0038-0717(97)00213-7

686 Behar F, Beaumont V, Penteado DB (2001) Rock-Eval 6 Technology: Performances and  
687 Developments. *Oil Gas Sci Technol* 56:111-134. doi: 10.2516/ogst:2001013

688 Beleites C, Sergo V (2015) hyperSpec: a package to handle hyperspectral data sets in R  
689 Berg B (2000) Litter decomposition and organic matter turnover in northern forest soils.  
690 For Ecol Manage 133:13-22. doi: 10.1016/S0378-1127(99)00294-7  
691 Borchers HW (2015) pracma: Practical numerical math functions  
692 Brêthes A, Ulrich E, Lanier M (1997) RENECOFOR : caractéristiques pédologiques des  
693 102 peuplements du réseau : observations de 1994/95. Office national des forêts, Département  
694 des recherches techniques, Fontainebleau, France  
695 Camino-Serrano M, Gielen B, Luysaert S, Ciais P, Vicca S, Guenet B, Vos BD, Cools N,  
696 Ahrens B, Altaf Arain M, Borken W, Clarke N, Clarkson B, Cummins T, Don A, Pannatier  
697 EG, Laudon H, Moore T, Nieminen TM, Nilsson MB, Peichl M, Schwendenmann L, Siemens  
698 J, Janssens I (2014) Linking variability in soil solution dissolved organic carbon to climate,  
699 soil type, and vegetation type. Glob Biogeochem Cycles 28:497-509. doi:  
700 10.1002/2013GB004726  
701 Canadell JG, Le Quéré C, Raupach MR, Field CB, Buitenhuis ET, Ciais P, Conway TJ,  
702 Gillett NP, Houghton RA, Marland G (2007) Contributions to accelerating atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>  
703 growth from economic activity, carbon intensity, and efficiency of natural sinks. PNAS  
704 104:18866-18870. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0702737104  
705 Cardinael R, Chevallier T, Barthès BG, Saby NPA, Parent T, Dupraz C, Bernoux M,  
706 Chenu C (2015) Impact of alley cropping agroforestry on stocks, forms and spatial  
707 distribution of soil organic carbon — A case study in a Mediterranean context. Geoderma  
708 259–260:288-299. doi: 10.1016/j.geoderma.2015.06.015  
709 Carter MR, Gregorich EG, Angers DA, Donald RG, Bolinder MA (1998) Organic C and N  
710 storage, and organic C fractions, in adjacent cultivated and forested soils of eastern Canada.  
711 Soil Tillage Res. doi: 10.1016/S0167-1987(98)00114-7

712 Cécillon L, Baudin F, Chenu C, Houot S, Jolivet R, Kätterer T, Lutfalla S, Macdonald A,  
713 van Oort F, Plante AF, Savignac F, Soucémariadin L, Barré P (2018) A model based on  
714 Rock-Eval thermal analysis to quantify the size of the centennially persistent organic carbon  
715 pool in temperate soils. *Biogeosciences Discussions* 2018:1-25. doi: 10.5194/bg-2018-15

716 Cleveland CC, Liptzin D (2007) C:N:P stoichiometry in soil: is there a "Redfield ratio" for  
717 the microbial biomass?. *Biogeochemistry* 85:235-252. doi: 10.1007/s10533-007-9132-0

718 Cole DW, Rapp M (1981) Elemental cycling in forest ecosystems. In: Reichle DE (ed)  
719 *Dynamic Properties of Forest Ecosystems*. Cambridge University Press, pp 341-409

720 Coleman K, Jenkinson D (1999) RothC-26.3. A Model for the Turn-over of Carbon in  
721 Soils. Model Description and Windows Users Guide. IACR – Rothamsted, Harpenden.

722 Cools N, Vesterdal L, De Vos B, Vanguelova E, Hansen K (2014) Tree species is the  
723 major factor explaining C:N ratios in European forest soils. *Forest Ecol Manag.* doi:  
724 10.1016/j.foreco.2013.06.047

725 Cotrufo FM, Ineson P, Roberts DJ (1995) Decomposition of birch leaf litters with varying  
726 C-to-N ratios. *Soil Biol Biochem.* doi: 10.1016/0038-0717(95)00043-E "

727 Crow SE, Swanston CW, Lajtha K, Brooks JR, Keirstead H (2007) Density fractionation  
728 of forest soils: methodological questions and interpretation of incubation results and turnover  
729 time in an ecosystem context. *Biogeochemistry* 85:69-90. doi: 10.1007/s10533-007-9100-8

730 Curtin D, Campbell CA, Jalil A (1998) Effects of acidity on mineralization: pH-  
731 dependence of organic matter mineralization in weakly acidic soils. *Soil Biol Biochem.* doi:  
732 10.1016/S0038-0717(97)00094-1

733 Diochon AC, Kellman L (2009) Physical fractionation of soil organic matter:  
734 Destabilization of deep soil carbon following harvesting of a temperate coniferous forest. *J*  
735 *Geophys Res* 114. doi: 10.1029/2008JG000844

736 Disnar JR, Guillet B, Keravis D, Di-Giovanni C, Sebag D (2003) Soil organic matter  
737 (SOM) characterization by Rock-Eval pyrolysis: scope and limitations. *Org Geochem* 34:327-  
738 343. doi: 10.1016/S0146-6380(02)00239-5

739 Dodla SK, Wang JJ, DeLaune RD (2012) Characterization of labile organic carbon in  
740 coastal wetland soils of the Mississippi River deltaic plain: Relationships to carbon  
741 functionalities. *Sci Total Environ* 435–436:151-158. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.06.090

742 Dungait JAJ, Hopkins DW, Gregory AS, Whitmore AP (2012) Soil organic matter  
743 turnover is governed by accessibility not recalcitrance. *Glob Change Biol* 18:1781-1796. doi:  
744 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2012.02665.x

745 Feng W, Shi Z, Jiang J, Xia J, Liang J, Zhou J, Luo Y (2016) Methodological uncertainty  
746 in estimating carbon turnover times of soil fractions. *Soil Biol Biochem* 100:118-124. doi:  
747 10.1016/j.soilbio.2016.06.003

748 Fissore C, Giardina CP, Kolka RK, Trettin CC, King GM, Jurgensen MF, Barton CD,  
749 McDowell SD (2008) Temperature and vegetation effects on soil organic carbon quality along  
750 a forested mean annual temperature gradient in North America. *Global Change Biol* 14:193-  
751 205. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01478.x

752 Fox J, Weisberg S (2011) *An R Companion to Applied Regression*

753 Frøseth RB, Bleken MA (2015) Effect of low temperature and soil type on the  
754 decomposition rate of soil organic carbon and clover leaves, and related priming effect. *Soil*  
755 *Biol Biochem*. doi: 10.1016/j.soilbio.2014.10.004

756 Gillespie AW, Sanei H, Diochon A, Ellert BH, Regier TZ, Chevrier D, Dynes JJ, Tarnocai  
757 C, Gregorich EG (2014) Perennially and annually frozen soil carbon differ in their  
758 susceptibility to decomposition: Analysis of Subarctic earth hummocks by bioassay, XANES  
759 and pyrolysis. *Soil Biol Biochem* 68:106-116. doi: 10.1016/j.soilbio.2013.09.021



760 Golchin A, Oades JM, Skjemstad JO, Clarke P (1994) Study of free and occluded  
761 particulate organic matter in soils by solid state  $^{13}\text{C}$  CP/MAS NMR spectroscopy and  
762 scanning electron microscopy. *Aust J Soil Res* 32:285-309. doi: 10.1071/SR9940285

763 Gregorich EG, Gillespie AW, Beare MH, Curtin D, Sanei H, Yanni SF (2015) Evaluating  
764 biodegradability of soil organic matter by its thermal stability and chemical composition. *Soil*  
765 *Biol Biochem* 91:182-191. doi: 10.1016/j.soilbio.2015.08.032

766 Harris D, Horwath WR, van Kessel C (2001) Acid fumigation of soils to remove  
767 carbonates prior to total organic carbon or CARBON-13 isotopic analysis. *Soil Sci Soc Am J*  
768 65:1853-1856. doi: 10.2136/sssaj2001.1853

769 Hassink J (1995) Density fractions of soil macroorganic matter and microbial biomass as  
770 predictors of C and N mineralization. *Soil Biol Biochem* 27:1099-1108. doi: 10.1016/0038-  
771 0717(95)00027-C

772 Hobbie SE, Ogdahl M, Chorover J, Chadwick OA, Oleksyn J, Zytkowskiak R, Reich PB  
773 (2007) Tree species effects on soil organic matter dynamics: The role of soil cation  
774 composition. *Ecosystems* 10:999-1018. doi: 10.1007/s10021-007-9073-4

775 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2000) Land Use, Land-Use Change and  
776 Forestry - A Special Report of the IPCC. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK

777 IUSS Working Group (2015) World reference base for soil resources 2014 (update 2015),  
778 international soil classification system for naming soils and creating legends for soil maps.  
779 World Soil Resources Reports

780 Jandl R, Lindner M, Vesterdal L, Bauwens B, Baritz R, Hagedorn F, Johnson DW,  
781 Minkkinen K, Byrne KA (2007) How strongly can forest management influence soil carbon  
782 sequestration?. *Geoderma* 137:253-268. doi: 10.1016/j.geoderma.2006.09.003

783 Jarvis PG, Ibrom A, Linder S (2005) 'Carbon forestry': managing forests to conserve  
784 carbon. In: Griffiths HG, Jarvis PG (eds) *The Carbon Balance of Forest Biomes*. Taylor &  
785 Francis, pp 356-377

786 Jenkinson DS, Poulton PR, Bryant C (2008) The turnover of organic carbon in subsoils.  
787 Part 1. Natural and bomb radiocarbon in soil profiles from the Rothamsted long-term field  
788 experiments. *Eur J Soil Sci* 59:391-399. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2389.2008.01025.x

789 Jobbágy EG, Jackson RB (2000) The vertical distribution of soil organic carbon and its  
790 relation to climate and vegetation. *Ecol Appl* 10:423-436. doi: 10.1890/1051-  
791 0761(2000)010[0423:TVDOSO]2.0.CO;2

792 Jonard M, Nicolas M, Coomes DA, Caignet I, Saenger A, Ponette Q (2017) Forest soils in  
793 France are sequestering substantial amounts of carbon. *Sci Total Environ* 574:616-628. doi:  
794 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.09.028

795 Kassambara A, Mundt F (2016) *factoextra: Extract and Visualize the Results of*  
796 *Multivariate Data Analyses*

797 Kindermann G, McCallum I, Fritz S, Obersteiner M (2008) A global forest growing stock,  
798 biomass and carbon map based on FAO statistics. *Silva Fenn* 42. doi: 10.14214/sf.244

799 Lafargue E, Marquis F, Pillot D (1998) Rock-Eval 6 Applications in Hydrocarbon  
800 Exploration, Production, and Soil Contamination Studies. *Oil Gas Sci Technol* 53:421-437.  
801 doi: 10.2516/ogst:1998036

802 Laganière J, Paré D, Bergeron Y, Chen HYH (2012) The effect of boreal forest  
803 composition on soil respiration is mediated through variations in soil temperature and C  
804 quality. *Soil Biol Biochem*. doi: 10.1016/j.soilbio.2012.04.024

805 Leifeld J, Zimmerman M, Fuhrer J, Conen F (2009) Storage and turnover of carbon in  
806 grassland soils along an elevation gradient in the Swiss Alps. *Global Change Biol* 15:668-  
807 679. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01782.x

808 Lorenz K, Lal R (2010) Carbon Sequestration in Forest Ecosystems. Springer Netherlands  
809 Lorenz K, Lal R (2005) The depth distribution of soil organic carbon in relation to land use  
810 and management and the potential of carbon sequestration in subsoil horizons. *Adv Agron*  
811 88:35-66. doi: 10.1016/S0065-2113(05)88002-2

812 Mason JA, Jacobs PM, Gruley KE, Reyerson P, Hanson PR (2016) Parent material  
813 influence on soil response to vegetation change, Southeastern Minnesota, U.S.A. *Geoderma*  
814 275:1-17. doi: 10.1016/j.geoderma.2016.04.004

815 Mathieu JA, Hatté C, Balesdent J, Parent É (2015) Deep soil carbon dynamics are driven  
816 more by soil type than by climate: a worldwide meta-analysis of radiocarbon profiles. *Global*  
817 *Change Biol* 21:4278-4292. doi: 10.1111/gcb.13012

818 Meier IC, Leuschner C (2010) Variation of soil and biomass carbon pools in beech forests  
819 across a precipitation gradient. *Global Change Biol* 16:1035-1045. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-  
820 2486.2009.02074.x

821 Melillo JM, Aber JD, Muratore JF (1982) Nitrogen and lignin control of hardwood leaf  
822 litter decomposition dynamics. *Ecology* 63:621-626. doi: 10.2307/1936780

823 Moni C, Rumpel C, Virto I, Chabbi A, Chenu C (2010) Relative importance of sorption  
824 versus aggregation for organic matter storage in subsoil horizons of two contrasting soils. *Eur*  
825 *J Soil Sci* 61:958-969. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2389.2010.01307.x

826 Mulder VL, Lacoste M, Martin MP, Richer-de-Forges A, Arrouays D (2015)  
827 Understanding large-extent controls of soil organic carbon storage in relation to soil depth and  
828 soil-landscape systems. *Glob Biogeochem Cycles* 29:1210-1229. doi:  
829 10.1002/2015GB005178

830 Nabuurs GJ, Thürig E, Heidema N, Armolaitis K, Biber P, Cienciala E, Kaufmann E,  
831 Mäkipää R, Nilsen P, Petritsch R, Pristova T, Rock J, Schelhaas MJ, Sievanen R, Somogyi Z,

832 Vallet P (2008) Hotspots of the European forests carbon cycle. For Ecol Manag. doi:  
833 10.1016/j.foreco.2008.04.009

834 Norby RJ, Cotrufo MF, Ineson P, O'Neill EG, Canadell JG (2001) Elevated CO<sub>2</sub>, litter  
835 chemistry, and decomposition: a synthesis. *Oecologia* 127:153-165. doi:  
836 10.1007/s004420000615

837 Olsen HR, Van Miegroet H (2010) Factors affecting carbon dioxide release from forest and  
838 rangeland soils in Northern Utah. *Soil Sci Soc Am J* 74:282-291. doi: 10.2136/sssaj2009.0095

839 Pan Y, Birdsey RA, Fang J, Houghton RA, Kauppi PE, Kurz WA, Phillips OL, Shvidenko  
840 AZ, Lewis SL, Canadell JG, Ciais P, Jackson RB, Pacala SW, McGuire AD, Piao S,  
841 Rautiainen A, Sitch S, Hayes D (2011) A large and persistent carbon sink in the world's  
842 forests. *Science* 333:988-993. doi: 10.1126/science.1201609

843 Pinheiro J, Bates D, DebRoy S, Sarkar D, Team RC (2016) *nlme: Linear and Nonlinear*  
844 *Mixed Effects Models*

845 Plante AF, Fernández JM, Leifeld J (2009) Application of thermal analysis techniques in  
846 soil science. *Geoderma* 153:1-10. doi: 10.1016/j.geoderma.2009.08.016

847 Poeplau C, Don A (2013) Sensitivity of soil organic carbon stocks and fractions to  
848 different land-use changes across Europe. *Geoderma*. doi: 10.1016/j.geoderma.2012.08.003

849 Ponette Q, Ulrich E, Brêthes A, Bonneau M, Lanier M (1997) *RENECOFOR - Chimie des*  
850 *sols dans les 102 peuplements du réseau : campagne de mesures 1993-95. ONF, Département*  
851 *des recherches techniques, Fontainebleau, France*

852 Prescott CE (2010) Litter decomposition: what controls it and how can we alter it to  
853 sequester more carbon in forest soils? *Biogeochemistry* 101:133-149. doi: 10.1007/s10533-  
854 010-9439-0

855 Quideau SA, Chadwick OA, Benesi A, Graham RC, Anderson MA (2001) A direct link  
856 between forest vegetation type and soil organic matter composition. *Geoderma*. doi:  
857 10.1016/S0016-7061(01)00055-6

858 R Core Team (2016) R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing

859 Rowley MC, Grand S, Verrecchia EP (2018) Calcium-mediated stabilisation of soil  
860 organic carbon. *Biogeochemistry* 137:27-49. doi: 10.1007/s10533-017-0410-1

861 Rumpel C, Kögel-Knabner I (2010) Deep soil organic matter---a key but poorly  
862 understood component of terrestrial C cycle. *Plant Soil* 338:143-158. doi: 10.1007/s11104-  
863 010-0391-5

864 Saenger A, Cécillon L, Poulénard J, Bureau F, De Daniéli S, Gonzalez J, Brun J (2015)  
865 Surveying the carbon pools of mountain soils: A comparison of physical fractionation and  
866 Rock-Eval pyrolysis. *Geoderma* 241–242:279-288. doi: 10.1016/j.geoderma.2014.12.001

867 Salomé C, Nunan N, Pouteau V, Lerch TZ, Chenu C (2010) Carbon dynamics in topsoil  
868 and in subsoil may be controlled by different regulatory mechanisms. *Global Change Biol*  
869 16:416-426. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.01884.x

870 Schiedung M, Don A, Wordell-Dietrich P, Alcántara V, Kuner P, Guggenberger G (2017)  
871 Thermal oxidation does not fractionate soil organic carbon with differing biological  
872 stabilities. *J Plant Nutr Soil Sci* 180:18-26. doi: 10.1002/jpln.201600172

873 Schmatz R, Recous S, Aita C, Tahir MM, Schu AL, Chaves B, Giacomini SJ (2017) Crop  
874 residue quality and soil type influence the priming effect but not the fate of crop residue C.  
875 *Plant Soil* 414:229-245. doi: 10.1007/s11104-016-3120-x

876 Schmidt MWI, Torn MS, Abiven S, Dittmar T, Guggenberger G, Janssens IA, Kleber M,  
877 Kögel-Knabner I, Lehmann J, Manning DAC, Nannipieri P, Rasse DP, Weiner S, Trumbore  
878 SE (2011) Persistence of soil organic matter as an ecosystem property. *Nature* 478:49-56. doi:  
879 10.1038/nature10386

880 Schrumpf M, Kaiser K, Guggenberger G, Persson T, Kögel-Knabner I, Schulze E- (2013)  
881 Storage and stability of organic carbon in soils as related to depth, occlusion within  
882 aggregates, and attachment to minerals. *Biogeosciences* 10:1675-1691. doi: 10.5194/bg-10-  
883 1675-2013

884 Schrumpf M, Kaiser K (2015) Large differences in estimates of soil organic carbon  
885 turnover in density fractions by using single and repeated radiocarbon inventories. *Geoderma*  
886 239–240:168-178. doi: 10.1016/j.geoderma.2014.09.025

887 Sebag D, Verrecchia EP, Cécillon L, Adatte T, Albrecht R, Aubert M, Bureau F, Cailleau  
888 G, Copard Y, Decaens T, Disnar J-, Hetényi M, Nyilas T, Trombino L (2016) Dynamics of  
889 soil organic matter based on new Rock-Eval indices. *Geoderma* 284:185-203. doi:  
890 10.1016/j.geoderma.2016.08.025

891 Six J, Conant RT, Paul EA, Paustian K (2002) Stabilization mechanisms of soil organic  
892 matter: Implications for C-saturation of soils. *Plant Soil* 241:155-176. doi:  
893 10.1023/A:1016125726789

894 Sjögersten S, Alewell C, Cécillon L, Hagedorn F, Jandl R, Leifeld J, Martinsen V,  
895 Schindlbacher A, Sebastià M-, Van Mieghroet H (2011) Mountain Soils in a Changing  
896 Climate? Vulnerability of Carbon Stocks and Ecosystem Feedbacks. In: *Soil Carbon in*  
897 *Sensitive European Ecosystems*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, UK, pp 118-148

898 Smith P, Bustamante M, Ahammad H, Clark H, Dong H, Elsiddig EA, Haberl H, Harper  
899 R, House J, Jafari M, Masera O, Mbow C, Ravindranath NH, Rice CW, Robledo Abad C,  
900 Romanovskaya A, Sperling F, Tubiello F (2014) Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use  
901 (AFOLU). In: Edenhofer O, Pichs-Madruga R, Sokona Y, Farahani E, Kadner S, Seyboth K,  
902 Adler A, Baum I, Brunner S, Eickemeier P, Kriemann B, Savolainen J, Schlömer S, von  
903 Stechow C, Zwickel T, Minx JC (eds) *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change*.  
904 Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental

905 Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY,  
906 USA, pp 811-922

907 Soucémarianadin LN, Cécillon L, Chenu C, Baudin F, Nicolas M, Girardin C, Barré P  
908 (2018) Is Rock-Eval 6 thermal analysis a good indicator of soil organic carbon lability? - A  
909 method-comparison study in forest soils. *Soil Biol Biochem* 117:108-116. doi:  
910 10.1016/j.soilbio.2017.10.025

911 Tewksbury CE, Van Miegroet H (2007) Soil organic carbon dynamics along a climatic  
912 gradient in a southern Appalachian spruce–fir forest. *Can J For Res* 37:1161-1172. doi:  
913 10.1139/X06-317

914 Tian Q, He H, Cheng W, Bai Z, Wang Y, Zhang X (2016) Factors controlling soil organic  
915 carbon stability along a temperate forest altitudinal gradient. *Sci Rep* 6:18783. doi:  
916 10.1038/srep18783

917 Torn MS, Trumbore SE, Chadwick OA, Vitousek PM, Hendricks DM (1997) Mineral  
918 control of soil organic carbon storage and turnover. *Nature* 389:170-173. doi: 10.1038/38260

919 Trumbore SE (1997) Potential responses of soil organic carbon to global environmental  
920 change. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 94:8284-8291

921 Trumbore SE, Chadwick OA, Amundson R (1996) Rapid exchange between soil carbon  
922 and atmospheric carbon dioxide driven by temperature change. *Science*. doi:  
923 10.1126/science.272.5260.393

924 Tyrrell ML, Ross J, Kelty M (2012) Carbon Dynamics in the Temperate Forest. In: Ashton  
925 MS, Tyrrell ML, Spalding D, Gentry B (eds) *Managing Forest Carbon in a Changing Climate*.  
926 Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp 77-107

927 Ulrich E (1995) Le réseau RENECOFOR : objectifs et réalisation. *Rev for fr* 47:107-124.  
928 doi: 10.4267/2042/26634

929 Van Miegroet H, Boettinger JL, Baker MA, Nielsen J, Evans D, Stum A (2005) Soil  
930 carbon distribution and quality in a montane rangeland-forest mosaic in northern Utah. *Forest*  
931 *Ecol Manag.* doi: 10.1016/j.foreco.2005.08.017

932 Vesterdal L, Elberling B, Christiansen JR, Callesen I, Schmidt IK (2012) Soil respiration  
933 and rates of soil carbon turnover differ among six common European tree species. *For Ecol*  
934 *Manag* 264:185-196. doi: 10.1016/j.foreco.2011.10.009

935 von Lützow M, Kögel-Knabner I, Ekschmitt K, Flessa H, Guggenberger G, Matzner E,  
936 Marschner B (2007) SOM fractionation methods: Relevance to functional pools and to  
937 stabilization mechanisms. *Soil Biol Biochem* 39:2183-2207. doi:  
938 10.1016/j.soilbio.2007.03.007

939 Vos C, Jaconi A, Jacobs A, Don A (2017) Hot regions of labile and stable soil organic  
940 carbon in Germany -- Spatial variability and driving factors. *SOIL* 2017:1-35. doi:  
941 10.5194/soil-2017-30

942 Wander M (2004) Soil organic matter fractions and their relevance to soil function. In:  
943 Magdoff F, Weil RR (eds) *Soil Organic Matter in Sustainable Agriculture*. CRC Press, pp 67-  
944 102

945 Wang Q, Zhong M (2016) Composition and mineralization of soil organic carbon pools in  
946 four single-tree species forest soils. *Journal of Forestry Research* 27:1277-1285. doi:  
947 10.1007/s11676-016-0244-z

948 Wiesmeier M, Prietzel J, Barthold F, Spörlein P, Geuß U, Hangen E, Reischl A, Schilling  
949 B, von Lützow M, Kögel-Knabner I (2013) Storage and drivers of organic carbon in forest  
950 soils of southeast Germany (Bavaria) – Implications for carbon sequestration. *For Ecol Manag*  
951 295:162-172. doi: 10.1016/j.foreco.2013.01.025

952 Wiesmeier M, Schad P, von Lützow M, Poeplau C, Spörlein P, Geuß U, Hangen E, Reischl  
953 A, Schilling B, Kögel-Knabner I (2014) Quantification of functional soil organic carbon pools



954 for major soil units and land uses in southeast Germany (Bavaria). *Agric Ecosyst Environ.*

955 doi: 10.1016/j.agee.2013.12.028

956 Wordell-Dietrich P, Don A, Helfrich M (2017) Controlling factors for the stability of

957 subsoil carbon in a Dystric Cambisol. *Geoderma*. doi: 10.1016/j.geoderma.2016.08.023

958 You Y, Wang J, Sun X, Tang Z, Zhou Z, Sun OJ (2016) Differential controls on soil

959 carbon density and mineralization among contrasting forest types in a temperate forest

960 ecosystem. *Sci Rep* 6:22411. doi: 10.1038/srep22411

961 Zhang J, Song C, Wenyan Y (2007) Tillage effects on soil carbon fractions in the Sanjiang

962 Plain, Northeast China. *Soil Tillage Res.* doi: 10.1016/j.still.2006.03.014

963 Zimmermann M, Leifeld J, Schmidt MWI, Smith P, Fuhrer J (2007) Measured soil organic

964 matter fractions can be related to pools in the RothC model. *Eur J Soil Sci* 58:658-667. doi:

965 10.1111/j.1365-2389.2006.00855.x

966

967 **Figures captions**

968 **Fig. 1** (a) Location of the 53 study sites from the French national network for the long term  
969 monitoring of forest ecosystems (RENECOFOR) and their repartition among the climatic  
970 zones and vegetation types and soil classes; (b) Number of samples by depths and analyses  
971 performed to assess SOC stability

972

973 **Fig. 2** Evolution of respired-C, POM-C, T<sub>50\_HC\_PYR</sub> and T<sub>50\_CO2\_OX</sub> in the five soil layers of the  
974 53 RENECOFOR plots. The horizontal black lines show the medians. The bottom and top of  
975 the box show the first and third quartiles, respectively. n= 53 for layers 0–10 cm, 10–20 cm  
976 and 20–40 cm; n = 50 (RE6 and POM-C) or 46 (respired-C) for layer 40–80 cm; n = 33 (RE6)  
977 or 31 (respired-C) for layer 80–100 cm. For each indicator, different letters indicate  
978 significant differences between the means of the different layers

979

980 **Fig. 3** Variations in the indicators of SOC stability respired-C and POM-C (top) and thermal  
981 indicators (T<sub>50\_HC\_PYR</sub> and T<sub>50\_CO2\_OX</sub>; bottom) as a function of vegetation type in the surface  
982 (0–10 cm) layer. The horizontal black line shows the median for each vegetation type. The  
983 bottom and top of the box show the first and third quartiles, respectively. n = 29 and 24 for  
984 coniferous and deciduous plots respectively. For each indicator, different letters indicate  
985 significant differences between the means of the different layers

986

987 **Fig. 4** Variations in indicators of SOC stability respired-C and POM-C (top) and thermal  
988 indicators (T<sub>50\_HC\_PYR</sub> and T<sub>50\_CO2\_OX</sub>; bottom) as a function of depth for all three soil classes.  
989 n= 53 for layers 0–10 cm, 10–20 cm and 20–40 cm; n = 50 (RE6 and POM-C) or 46  
990 (respired-C) for layer 40–80 cm; n = 33 (RE6) or 31 (respired-C) for layer 80–100 cm

991

992 **Fig. 5** Variations in the thermal indicator  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  (stable SOC pool) in the three climatic  
993 zones as a function of depth

994

995 **Fig. 6** Principal components analysis (PCA) loadings plots (top) and biplots (bottom) of the 4  
996 indicators of SOC stability (red arrows) along the first two principal component axes (PC1  
997 and PC2) for two layers: (left) 0–10 cm ( $n = 53$ ) and (right) 40–80 cm ( $n = 46$ ). In the loading  
998 plots, the physico-chemical parameters and climatic data (black arrows) were projected in the  
999 circle of correlations for information. In the biplots, the samples were represented by their soil  
1000 class and the 95% ellipses for the three soil classes were added

**Table 1** Mean (and standard deviation) of SOC content, C/N ratio of the bulk soil and RE6-derived bulk chemistry parameters (HI, OI<sub>RE6</sub>), as well as the averaged values derived from Ponette et al. (1997) and Jonard et al. (2017) for the texture, pH<sub>water</sub> and the cationic exchange capacity, in the five soil layers for the 53 RENECOFOR plots

depth (cm)	n	SOC		C/N ratio		HI	OI <sub>RE6</sub>	clay			silt	sand		pH <sub>water</sub>		CEC <sup>a</sup>			
		%				mg HC / g SOC)	mg O <sub>2</sub> / g SOC	%	%	%		%			cmol+/kg				
		(composite sample, determined in this study)						(averaged from Ponette et al., 1997 and Jonard et al. 2017)											
0–10	53	5.1	(2.7)	16.9	(4.5)	276	(77)	225	(37)	23	(14)	36	(18)	42	(29)	4.9	(1.0)	13.3	(13.1)
10–20	53	2.9	(2.0)	16.4	(4.9)	218	(72)	255	(46)	21	(13)	37	(18)	42	(29)	5.1	(1.1)	10.9	(12.7)
20–40	53	1.8	(1.4)	14.8	(4.3)	170	(57)	299	(68)	20	(14)	36	(18)	43	(28)	5.4	(1.3)	10.0	(12.5)
40–80	50	0.8	(0.8)	11.6	(3.8)	133	(33)	437	(137)	20	(15)	32	(17)	48	(27)	5.8	(1.4)	7.3	(8.5)
80–100	33	0.6	(0.5)	9.7	(4.0)	122	(27)	525	(145)	22	(17)	34	(16)	44	(27)	6.1	(1.6)	7.5	(8.3)


<sup>a</sup> determined by extraction of the exchangeable cations with barium chloride (ISO 11260:1994)


**Table 2** Results ( $p$ -value) of the 3-way ANOVA (analysis by layer) with the factors soil class (soil), vegetation type (veg) and climatic zone (clim) and their interactions for each response variable obtained from respiration test (respired-C), POM fractionation (POM-C) and RE6 thermal analysis ( $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$ ;  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$ ). If the response variable needed to be transformed to conform to the assumptions of ANOVA, the transformation that was used is specified. Significance is indicated as follows: \*\*\*:  $p < 0.001$ ; \*\*:  $p < 0.01$ ; \*:  $p < 0.05$ ; .:  $p < 0.1$ ; NS = not significant

		Factor			Interaction		
<b>Respiration test</b>							
depth (cm)	variable	soil	veg	clim	soil × veg	soil × clim	veg × clim
0–10	respired-C	**	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
10–20	$\log_{10}$ (respired-C + 1)	***	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
20–40	$\log_{10}$ (respired-C + 1)	**	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
40–80	$\log_{10}$ (respired-C + 1)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
80–100	$\log_{10}$ (respired-C + 1)	*	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
<b>POM fractionation</b>							
depth (cm)	variable	soil	veg	clim	soil × veg	soil × clim	veg × clim
0–10	POM-C	*	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
40–80	POM-C	*	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
<b>Rock-Eval thermal analysis</b>							
depth (cm)	variable	soil	veg	clim	soil × veg	soil × clim	veg × clim
0–10	$T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$	***	***	NS	NS	.	NS
10–20	$T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$	NS	NS	NS	.	NS	NS
20–40	$T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$	*	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
40–80	$T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
80–100	$T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
0–10	$T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$	**	***	**	NS	NS	NS
10–20	$T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$	NS	*	**	NS	*	NS
20–40	$T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$	NS	*	**	NS	*	NS
40–80	$T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$	*	NS	***	NS	NS	NS
80–100	$T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$	NS	NS	*	NS	NS	NS


**Table 3** Spearman correlation coefficients between the RE6-derived temperature parameters ( $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$  and  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$ ), the 10-week mineralizable SOC (respired-C), the proportion of SOC in the POM fraction (POM-C) and the physico-chemical properties of the samples (C content; C/N ratio; HI;  $OI_{RE6}$ ; texture, clay and sand content; pH; cationic exchange capacity, CEC) and climatic data of the plots (mean annual precipitation, MAP; mean annual temperature, MAT). Significance is indicated as follows: \*\*\*:  $p < 0.001$ ; \*\*:  $p < 0.01$ ; \*:  $p < 0.05$ . The high ( $> 0.6$ ) correlations are marked in bold.  $n = 242$  for the RE6 parameters,  $n = 236$  for respired-C and  $n = 103$  for POM-C


	$T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$	$T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$	respired-C	POM-C
SOC	-0.58***	<b>-0.72***</b>	0.03	0.52***
C/N ratio	-0.34***	-0.43***	-0.13*	<b>0.61***</b>
HI	<b>-0.67***</b>	-0.53***	0.08	<b>0.67***</b>
$OI_{RE6}$	<b>0.63***</b>	0.50***	-0.04	<b>-0.76***</b>
Clay	-0.06	-0.03	0.19**	-0.18
Sand	0.02	0.10	-0.15*	0.18
$pH_{water}$	0.31***	0.33***	0.23***	-0.54***
CEC	-0.33***	-0.25***	0.31***	0.08
MAP	0.06	-0.20**	-0.16*	-0.11
MAT	0.01	0.19**	-0.09	-0.02

















## Supplementary material captions

**Online Resource 1** Description of the Rock-Eval 6 thermal analysis (adapted from Baudin et al., 2017) and calculation of the two RE6-derived parameters (hydrogen index;  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$ , the temperature at which 50% of the residual SOM was oxidized to  $CO_2$  during the oxidation phase)

Baudin F, Tribouvillard N, Trichet J (2017) *Géologie De La Matière Organique*. EDP Sciences, Lilles, France.

**Online Resource 2** Correlation between C content (%) of isovolumetrically pooled samples (measured in this study as detailed in *Materials and Methods* subsection a) and average values of the 5 replicates  $\times$  5 subplots from RENECOFOR samples (calculated with values from Jonard et al. (2017) and Ponette et al. (1997) for samples 0–40cm and 40–100 cm, respectively) for a given soil layer ( $n = 242$ ). The 1:1 line has been added in red for reference

Jonard M, Nicolas M, Coomes DA, Caignet I, Saenger A, Ponette Q (2017) Forest soils in France are sequestering substantial amounts of carbon. *Sci Total Environ* 574:616-628

Ponette Q, Ulrich E, Brêthes A, Bonneau M, Lanier M (1997) RENECOFOR - Chimie des sols dans les 102 peuplements du réseau : campagne de mesures 1993-95. ONF, Département des recherches techniques, Fontainebleau, France

**Online Resource 3** Details of models and their significant terms selected to explain variations in respired-C and POM-C,  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$ , and  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  in the 53 study plots (analysis by profile). All models used a gls function (see details in the *Calculations and statistical analyses* section)

**Online Resource 4** Mean (and standard deviation) of the indicators of labile SOC

( $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$ , POM-C; respired-C) and stable SOC ( $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$ ) for each soil class in the five different layers. The total SOC content was added for reference

**Online Resource 5** Table of correlations for all samples and for each layer individually between the indicators of the SOC pools and the physico-chemical properties (SOC content, C/N ratio, HI, OIRE6, texture, pH, cationic exchange capacity), the climatic data of the plots (mean annual precipitation; MAP and mean annual temperature; MAT) and the chemical properties (C/N ratio) of the inputs and humus. Significance is indicated as follows: \*\*\*:  $p < 0.001$ ; \*\*:  $p < 0.01$ ; \*:  $p < 0.05$ . The high ( $> 0.6$ ) correlations obtained with the SOC pools indicators are marked in bold.  $n = 242$  total;  $n = 53$  for layers 1 to 3 and  $n = 50$  and  $n = 33$  for layers 4 and 5 respectively unless specified otherwise


**Online Resource 6** Distribution of the mean annual precipitation (MAP) and mean annual temperature (MAT) in the 53 study sites as a function of vegetation type illustrating a bias towards coniferous stands being in wetter and colder locations.  $n = 29$  and  $24$  for coniferous and deciduous, respectively

# hydrogen index (HI; mg HC/g C)


# oxygen index ( $OI_{RE6}$ ; mg O<sub>2</sub>/g C)

21–62 mg soil sample



minerals




PYROLYSIS  
(inert conditions)




OXIDATION



Stage 1:  
pyrolysis (N<sub>2</sub>)




organic carbon  
mineral carbon



Stage 2:  
oxidation (air)


RE6 Oxidation IR signal

(mg CO<sub>2</sub> g<sup>-1</sup> soil)



Monitoring CO, CO<sub>2</sub> gases  
(20 °C·min<sup>-1</sup>)

$T_5$   $T_{50}$   $T_{95}$   $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  (°C)





**Online Resource 3** Details of models and their significant terms selected to explain variations in respired-C and POM-C,  $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$ , and  $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$  in the 53 study plots (analysis by profile). All models used a gls function (see details in the *Calculations and statistical analyses* section)

Response variable	Transformation	Predictors in final model <sup>s</sup>	Level of significance <i>p</i> -value
respired-C	$\log_{10}(\text{respired-C} + 1)$	soil + depth + soil × depth	soil < 0.0001; depth = 0.0823; depth × soil = 0.0417
POM-C	$\log_{10}(\text{POM-C})$	depth + soil	depth < 0.0001 and soil = 0.0114
$T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$		depth + soil + veg + depth × soil + depth × veg + soil × veg	depth and depth × soil < 0.0001; soil = 0.1440; veg = 0.0665; depth × veg = 0.0023; soil × veg = 0.0236
$T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$		depth + veg + climate + depth × climate	all < 0.0001 except climate = 0.0272

<sup>s</sup> For all models, as a preliminary inspection of the variance of a given factor showed heterogeneity among the various layers, we used a constant variance function [ $\text{varIdent}(\text{form} = \sim 1 \mid \text{depth})$ ], which allowed five different variances, one for each soil layer. We also used the compound symmetry structure [ $\text{corCompSymm}(\text{form} = \sim 1 \mid \text{plot})$ ], which is similar to the variance structure of a random-intercept-only model. In our case, it allowed to treat each site as random factor.

**Online Resource 4** Mean (and standard deviation) of the indicators of labile ( $T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$ , POM-C), very labile (respired-C) and stable SOC ( $T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$ ) for each soil class in the five different layers. The basic soil physico-chemical properties (texture, total SOC content, C/N ratio and pH) were added for reference

layer	soil class	n	$T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$ (°C)	$T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$ (°C)	n	POM-C (%) OC)	n	respired-C ( $\mu\text{g}$ $\text{CO}_2\text{-C}\cdot\mu\text{g}^{-1}$ soil C in %)	n	clay (%)	silt (%)	sand (%)	C content (%)	C/N ratio	pH
0–10 cm	ALL	53	422 (8)	399 (8)	53	22.6 (7.3)	53	1.73 (0.57)	53	22 (14)	36 (18)	42 (29)	5.1 (2.7)	16.9 (4.5)	4.9 (1.0)
	dystric Cambisol	18	420 (8)	399 (8)	18	23.0 (7.5)	18	1.87 (0.70)	18	18 (9)	31 (14)	51 (21)	4.1 (1.8)	16.8 (3.4)	4.5 (0.3)
	eutric Cambisol	16	428 (7)	403 (10)	16	19.2 (5.6)	16	2.19 (0.62)	16	37 (11)	50 (13)	13 (20)	5.1 (1.9)	13.3 (1.5)	6.2 (0.9)
	entic Podzol	19	417 (9)	396 (8)	19	25.1 (7.6)	19	1.13 (0.38)	19	15 (9)	28 (19)	57 (25)	6 (3.6)	19.9 (5.0)	4.1 (0.2)
10–20 cm	ALL	53	434 (7)	408 (12)		nd	53	1.61 (0.56)	53	21 (13)	37 (18)	42 (29)	2.9 (2.0)	16.4 (4.9)	5.1 (1.1)
	dystric Cambisol	18	434 (8)	409 (10)		nd	18	1.54 (0.64)	18	17 (9)	32 (14)	51 (21)	1.9 (0.7)	16.3 (3.5)	4.6 (0.3)
	eutric Cambisol	16	435 (6)	410 (14)		nd	16	2.13 (0.74)	16	36 (11)	51 (11)	13 (17)	3.5 (1.6)	12.4 (1.1)	6.5 (1.0)
	entic Podzol	19	433 (8)	404 (11)		nd	19	1.15 (0.31)	19	13 (7)	29 (20)	58 (25)	3.3 (2.7)	19.8 (5.4)	4.3 (0.2)
20–40 cm	ALL	53	441 (7)	418 (15)		nd	53	1.43 (0.68)	53	20 (14)	36 (18)	43 (28)	1.8 (1.4)	14.8 (4.3)	5.4 (1.3)
	dystric Cambisol	18	444 (8)	421 (10)		nd	18	1.38 (0.61)	18	17 (9)	33 (14)	51 (21)	1.1 (0.4)	14.8 (3.8)	4.8 (0.3)
	eutric Cambisol	16	437 (5)	417 (16)		nd	16	1.86 (0.84)	16	35 (13)	48 (12)	17 (17)	2.4 (1.4)	11.3 (1.3)	7.2 (1.0)
	entic Podzol	19	443 (6)	417 (17)		nd	19	1.06 (0.58)	19	11 (6)	30 (20)	59 (25)	2.1 (1.8)	17.7 (4.3)	4.6 (0.1)
40–80 cm	ALL	50	448 (10)	431 (17)	50	11.5 (6.2)	46	1.34 (0.67)	50	20 (15)	32 (17)	48 (27)	0.8 (0.8)	11.6 (3.8)	5.8 (1.4)
	dystric Cambisol	18	449 (7)	438 (15)	18	13.3 (6.3)	17	1.48 (0.62)	18	18 (10)	28 (11)	54 (19)	0.5 (0.3)	10.5 (3.5)	5.1 (0.6)
	eutric Cambisol	14	444 (9)	424 (19)	14	7.8 (3.5)	14	1.51 (0.75)	14	35 (18)	41 (13)	24 (25)	0.9 (0.5)	9.3 (1.9)	7.9 (0.6)
	entic Podzol	18	450 (12)	430 (18)	18	12.5 (6.8)	15	1.03 (0.64)	18	11 (5)	28 (20)	62 (25)	1.1 (1.1)	14.6 (3.4)	4.8 (0.2)
80–100 cm	ALL	33	452 (13)	437 (17)		nd	31	1.17 (0.66)	33	22 (17)	34 (16)	44 (27)	0.6 (0.5)	9.7 (4.0)	6.1 (1.6)
	dystric Cambisol	11	450 (11)	445 (12)		nd	11	1.57 (0.91)	11	20 (11)	30 (12)	50 (19)	0.3 (0.2)	7.2 (1.9)	5.3 (1.0)
	eutric Cambisol	10	448 (11)	427 (16)		nd	10	1.14 (0.59)	10	38 (19)	41 (12)	21 (23)	0.7 (0.2)	8.4 (1.6)	8.2 (0.6)
	entic Podzol	12	458 (18)	439 (22)		nd	10	0.79 (0.49)	12	10 (4)	30 (21)	59 (23)	0.8 (0.7)	13.1 (4.6)	5.0 (0.4)
0–100 cm	ALL	242	439 (9)	419 (14)	103	17.2 (8.8)	236	1.46 (0.63)	242	21 (14)	35 (17)	44 (28)	2.4 (2.4)	14.2 (5.0)	5.4 (1.3)

**Online Resource 5** Table of correlations for all samples and for each layer individually between the indicators of the SOC pools and the physico-chemical properties (SOC content, C/N ratio, HI,  $OI_{RE6}$ , texture, pH, cationic exchange capacity), the climatic data of the plots (mean annual precipitation; MAP and mean annual temperature; MAT) and the chemical properties (C/N ratio) of the inputs and humus. Significance is indicated as follows: \*\*\*:  $p < 0.001$ ; \*\*:  $p < 0.01$ ; \*:  $p < 0.05$ . The high ( $> 0.6$ ) correlations obtained with the SOC pools indicators are marked in bold.  $n = 242$  total;  $n = 53$  for layers 1 to 3 and  $n = 50$  and  $n = 33$  for layers 4 and 5 respectively unless specified otherwise

	POM-C <sup>§</sup>	respired-C*	$T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$	$T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$	SOC	C/N ratio (soil)	HI	$OI_{RE6}$	Clay	Sand	pH <sub>water</sub>	CEC	MAP	MAT	C/N ratio (inputs)
respired-C	0.20														
$T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$	<b>-0.73***</b>	-0.32***													
$T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$	-0.56***	-0.15*	<b>0.67***</b>												
SOC	0.52***	0.03	-0.58***	<b>-0.72***</b>		0.42***									
C/N ratio (soil)	<b>0.61***</b>	-0.13*	-0.34***	-0.43***	0.42***										
HI	<b>0.67***</b>	0.08	<b>-0.67***</b>	-0.53***	0.58***	0.62***									
$OI_{RE6}$	<b>-0.76***</b>	-0.04	<b>0.63***</b>	0.50***	-0.56***	-0.78***	-0.84***								
Clay	-0.18	0.19**	-0.06	-0.03	0.31***	-0.51***	-0.16*	0.31***							
Sand	0.18	-0.15*	0.02	0.10	-0.32***	0.45***	0.14*	-0.28***	-0.89***						
pH <sub>water</sub>	-0.54***	0.23***	0.31***	0.33***	-0.22***	-0.61***	-0.45***	0.59***	0.44***	-0.45***					
CEC	0.08	0.31***	-0.33***	-0.25***	0.48***	-0.31***	0.14*	0.06	0.74***	-0.69***	0.47***				
MAP	-0.11	-0.16*	0.06	-0.20**	0.36***	-0.01	-0.06	0.12	0.14*	-0.17**	0.07	0.12			
MAT	-0.02	-0.09	0.01	0.19**	-0.25***	-0.02	0.13*	-0.11	-0.08	0.06	-0.22***	-0.22***	-0.60***		
C/N ratio (inputs)	0.22*	0.16*	-0.09	-0.16*	-0.07	0.24***	-0.05	-0.06	-0.24***	0.23***	-0.03	-0.17**	-0.24***	-0.08	
C/N ratio (humus)	0.01	0.38***	-0.14*	-0.11	-0.01	-0.03	-0.08	0.10	0.12	-0.14*	0.40***	0.18**	-0.05	-0.06	0.44***

<sup>§</sup> n = 99

\* n = 236

#### LAYER 1: 0–10 cm

	POM-C	respired-C	$T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$	$T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$	SOC	C/N ratio (soil)	HI	$OI_{RE6}$	Clay	Sand	pH <sub>water</sub>	CEC	MAP	MAT	C/N ratio (inputs)
respired-C	-0.29*														
$T_{50\_HC\_PYR}$	-0.44***	0.12													
$T_{50\_CO2\_OX}$	-0.19	0.13	0.45***												
SOC	0.17	-0.20	-0.10	-0.28*											
C/N ratio (soil)	0.56***	-0.51***	-0.55***	-0.19	-0.08										
HI	0.32*	-0.43**	-0.30*	0.07	-0.29*	0.67***									
$OI_{RE6}$	-0.41**	0.52***	0.40**	-0.06	0.25	-0.80***	-0.91***								
Clay	-0.29*	0.43**	0.44**	-0.03	0.44**	-0.70***	-0.71***	0.75***							
Sand	0.32*	-0.41**	-0.50***	-0.08	-0.32*	0.65***	0.61***	-0.65***	-0.88***						
pH <sub>water</sub>	-0.35**	<b>0.62***</b>	0.46***	0.36**	0.06	-0.70***	-0.61***	0.70***	0.60***	-0.62***					
CEC	-0.16	0.30*	0.35*	0.00	0.60***	-0.60***	-0.72***	0.72***	0.78***	-0.72***	0.64***				
MAP	-0.10	0.10	-0.11	-0.29*	0.53***	-0.25	-0.37**	0.35*	0.33*	-0.21	0.06	0.39**			
MAT	-0.09	-0.30*	0.14	0.25	-0.39**	0.10	0.32*	-0.30*	-0.26	0.13	-0.21	-0.45***	-0.61***		
C/N ratio (inputs)	0.31*	-0.03	-0.41**	-0.25	-0.07	0.47***	-0.02	-0.13	-0.26	0.28*	-0.14	-0.16	-0.25	-0.06	
C/N ratio (humus)	-0.04	0.47***	-0.10	0.10	-0.17	-0.07	-0.41**	0.34*	0.11	-0.16	0.42**	0.14	-0.05	-0.07	0.45***

**LAYER 2: 10–20 cm**

	POM-C	respired-C	T <sub>50_HC_PYR</sub>	T <sub>50_CO2_OX</sub>	SOC	C/N ratio (soil)	HI	OI <sub>RE6</sub>	Clay	Sand	pH <sub>water</sub>	CEC	MAP	MAT	C/N ratio (inputs)	
respired-C	nd															
T <sub>50_HC_PYR</sub>	nd	0.00														
T <sub>50_CO2_OX</sub>	nd	0.02	0.40**													
SOC	nd	-0.13	0.08	-0.09												
C/N ratio (soil)	nd	-0.33*	-0.13	-0.04	-0.34*											
HI	nd	-0.24	-0.26	0.14	-0.28*	0.60***										
OI <sub>RE6</sub>	nd	0.34*	0.21	-0.22	0.37**	-0.73***	-0.74***									
Clay	nd	0.29*	0.10	0.07	0.60***	-0.71***	-0.53***	0.65***								
Sand	nd	-0.29*	-0.12	-0.05	-0.52***	0.66***	0.44**	-0.58***	-0.88***							
pH <sub>water</sub>	nd	<b>0.60***</b>	0.08	0.29*	0.28*	-0.62***	-0.36**	0.51***	0.59***	-0.58***						
CEC	nd	0.27*	0.13	-0.01	0.73***	-0.65***	-0.40**	0.60***	0.76***	-0.77***	0.64***					
MAP	nd	-0.08	-0.06	-0.24	0.66***	-0.20	-0.17	0.23	0.30*	-0.24	0.10	0.39**				
MAT	nd	-0.20	-0.05	0.21	-0.47***	0.12	0.25	-0.29*	-0.20	0.12	-0.27	-0.42**	-0.61***			
C/N ratio (inputs)	nd	0.20	-0.05	-0.25	-0.21	0.32*	-0.12	0.02	-0.26	0.28*	-0.05	-0.23	-0.25	-0.06		
C/N ratio (humus)	nd	0.53***	-0.12	-0.01	-0.02	-0.14	-0.22	0.27*	0.14	-0.15	0.51***	0.11	-0.05	-0.07	0.45***	

**LAYER 3: 20–40 cm**

	POM-C	respired-C	T <sub>50_HC_PYR</sub>	T <sub>50_CO2_OX</sub>	SOC	C/N ratio (soil)	HI	OI <sub>RE6</sub>	Clay	Sand	pH <sub>water</sub>	CEC	MAP	MAT	C/N ratio (inputs)	
respired-C	nd															
T <sub>50_HC_PYR</sub>	nd	-0.33*														
T <sub>50_CO2_OX</sub>	nd	0.06	0.37**													
SOC	nd	-0.21	-0.12	-0.41**												
C/N ratio (soil)	nd	-0.27	0.21	0.06	-0.15											
HI	nd	-0.10	-0.21	0.05	0.13	0.48***										
OI <sub>RE6</sub>	nd	0.11	-0.05	-0.31*	0.20	-0.76***	-0.65***									
Clay	nd	0.29*	-0.22	-0.04	0.46***	-0.74***	-0.34*	0.70***								
Sand	nd	-0.23	0.21	0.15	-0.48***	0.68***	0.24	-0.64***	-0.90***							
pH <sub>water</sub>	nd	0.45***	-0.32*	-0.15	0.29*	-0.47***	-0.11	0.40**	0.54***	-0.50***						
CEC	nd	0.19	-0.30*	-0.24	0.62***	-0.59***	-0.13	0.51***	0.77***	-0.76***	0.65***					
MAP	nd	-0.15	0.02	-0.38**	0.72***	-0.05	0.10	0.11	0.20	-0.25	0.07	0.31*				
MAT	nd	0.00	-0.07	0.33*	-0.49***	0.03	0.16	-0.25	-0.16	0.13	-0.26	-0.35**	-0.61***			
C/N ratio (inputs)	nd	0.04	0.12	-0.16	-0.26	0.26	-0.25	0.00	-0.25	0.27	0.10	-0.27	-0.25	-0.06		
C/N ratio (humus)	nd	0.41**	-0.26	-0.19	-0.02	-0.09	-0.17	0.19	0.13	-0.11	0.59***	0.14	-0.05	-0.07	0.45***	

**LAYER 4: 40–80 cm**

	POM-C	respired-C*	T <sub>50_HC_PYR</sub>	T <sub>50_CO2_OX</sub>	SOC	C/N ratio (soil)	HI	OI <sub>RE6</sub>	Clay	Sand	pH <sub>water</sub>	CEC	MAP	MAT	C/N ratio (inputs)	
respired-C	0.47***															
T <sub>50_HC_PYR</sub>	-0.35*	-0.41**														
T <sub>50_CO2_OX</sub>	-0.01	-0.01	0.19													
SOC	-0.43**	-0.54***	0.21	-0.49***												
C/N ratio (soil)	0.30*	-0.17	0.13	-0.21	0.29*											
HI	0.06	-0.03	-0.21	-0.24	0.19	0.23										
OI <sub>RE6</sub>	-0.42**	0.13	0.11	0.22	-0.07	-0.65***	-0.43**									
Clay	-0.34*	-0.08	0.03	0.12	0.33*	-0.55***	-0.06	0.62***								
Sand	-0.42**	0.16	-0.12	0.10	-0.48***	0.44**	0.04	-0.51***	-0.90***							
pH <sub>water</sub>	0.46***	0.03	-0.02	-0.18	0.20	-0.27	0.09	0.28	0.36*	-0.36*						
CEC	-0.34*	0.13	-0.08	-0.02	0.25	-0.49***	0.05	0.52***	0.80***	-0.75***	0.66***					
MAP	-0.25	-0.42**	0.16	-0.45**	0.69***	0.36*	0.17	-0.13	-0.03	-0.12	-0.04	-0.07				
MAT	0.04	0.09	0.13	0.50***	-0.48***	-0.28*	0.03	0.16	0.08	0.01	-0.15	-0.06	-0.58***			
C/N ratio (inputs)	0.33*	0.30*	-0.19	-0.22	-0.15	0.21	-0.08	-0.12	-0.31*	0.26	0.01	-0.26	-0.24	-0.11		
C/N ratio (humus)	0.10	0.29	-0.27	-0.29*	0.02	0.13	0.01	0.11	0.00	-0.06	0.37**	0.15	-0.04	-0.10	0.44**	

\* n = 46

**LAYER 5: 80–100 cm**

	POM-C	respired-C*	T <sub>50_HC_PYR</sub>	T <sub>50_CO2_OX</sub>	SOC	C/N ratio (soil)	HI	OI <sub>RE6</sub>	Clay	Sand	pH <sub>water</sub>	CEC	MAP	MAT	C/N ratio (inputs)	
respired-C	nd															
T <sub>50_HC_PYR</sub>	nd	-0.48**														
T <sub>50_CO2_OX</sub>	nd	-0.12	0.08													
SOC	nd	-0.43*	0.34	-0.69***												
C/N ratio (soil)	nd	-0.30	0.37*	-0.26	0.39*											
HI	nd	0.17	-0.39*	-0.30	0.04	0.00										
OI <sub>RE6</sub>	nd	0.31	-0.18	0.25	-0.29	-0.58***	-0.14									
Clay	nd	-0.10	-0.11	0.02	0.14	-0.51**	0.09	0.38*								
Sand	nd	0.09	-0.06	0.17	-0.30	0.41*	-0.06	-0.29	-0.86***							
pH <sub>water</sub>	nd	-0.01	-0.03	-0.46**	0.39*	-0.12	0.22	-0.18	0.36*	-0.37*						
CEC	nd	0.27	-0.36*	-0.13	0.04	-0.36*	0.30	0.21	0.72***	-0.60***	0.64***					
MAP	nd	-0.21	0.26	-0.34	0.60***	0.46**	0.05	-0.11	-0.30	0.10	0.04	-0.24				
MAT	nd	-0.12	0.09	0.43*	-0.43*	-0.27	0.13	0.29	0.27	-0.17	-0.24	0.03	-0.54**			
C/N ratio (inputs)	nd	0.45*	-0.12	-0.20	-0.01	-0.08	-0.21	0.13	-0.09	-0.05	-0.03	-0.06	-0.12	-0.13		
C/N ratio (humus)	nd	0.25	-0.07	-0.22	0.13	0.02	0.04	0.14	0.27	-0.34	0.14	0.25	-0.06	0.05	0.41*	

\* n = 31

