

Point-by-point response to the reviews

Part A: Authors' response to comments of reviewer # 1

Referee's comment:

I found the manuscript by Rongliang Jia et al., interesting and fall within the scope of Biogeoscience Journal - under the sub-title "Plant– soil interactions", although its results, related to the combined effects of drought and sand burial on moss crust, are particular interest to areas such as southeastern fringe of the Tengger Desert.

I have only minor comments:

I found their results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions. The title is too long and should be shortened.

Authors' response:

Because Bryum argenteum is widely distributed throughout the world, our findings could also be extended to ecosystem restoration and management in deserts beyond China.

The title was shortened to “The mutually antagonistic effect of drought and sand burial enables the biocrust moss Bryum argenteum Hedw. to survive in an arid sandy desert”

Referee's comment:

Where are the Key words?

Authors' response:

We have added “antagonistic effect, drought, sand burial, Bryum argenteum” as Key words in the new version of the manuscript.

Referee's comment:

Moss not always represents the highest successional stage of the biocrust development. In most cases lichens as a slow growers are representing this stage, especially under dry conditions. However, climate with high rainfall may encourage moss growth in some areas such as the located in the southeastern fringe of the Tengger Desert.

Authors' response:

It is true that a moss crust is not always the highest successional stage of biocrust development throughout arid and semiarid regions.

We revised the introductory sentences to, “It can represent the highest succession stage among the diverse range of surface-dwelling cryptogams (e.g., cyanobacteria, green algae, and lichen, which are also referred to as biocrusts) and it can make a major contribution to soil stability and fertility in many arid sandy desert ecosystems.” in L8-11 in the Abstract and “It can represent the highest succession stage among the diverse range of surface-dwelling cryptogams (e.g., cyanobacteria, green algae, and lichen, which are also referred to as bio crusts) and make a major contribution to soil stability and fertility in many arid and semiarid sandy desert ecosystems (Weber et al., 2016)” in L46-49 in the Introduction.

Referee's comment:

Line 214 - the chlorophyll a content of argenteum was found should be B. argenteum.

Authors' response:

We replaced "argenteum" with "*B. argenteum*" in L215.

Referee's comment:

Table 1. "Changes in the percentage cover of a biocrust dominated by *Bryum. argenteum* in response to sand burial depth in spring and autumn" should be " Table 1. Changes in the percentage cover of the soil surface, a biocrust dominated by *Bryum argenteum* in response to sand burial depth in spring and autumn".

Authors' response:

To avoid misunderstanding, we have revised the heading of Table 1 as you suggested: "Table 1. Changes in the percentage cover of *Bryum argenteum* Hedw. within a biocrust in response to sand burial depth in spring and autumn."

Part B: Authors' response to comments of reviewer # 2

Referee's comment:

This paper presents research on the ability of biocrust mosses - in particular *Bryum argenteum* - to survive multiple stresses in dryland ecosystems. The concept is good and this research may ultimately support better land management and interventions, enabled by knowing the environmental controls on dryland biota. The novelty of the work is related to the simultaneous assessment of two stressors and their interactions: drought and burial. The experimental work appears to have been planned and carried out carefully with attention to detail, which gives me confidence in the results. The results are presented in quite a confusing way though, which made it difficult for this reader to draw own interpretation and conclusions. A few details of the method were also not clear enough for me to fully understand the results, for example I was not sure whether the moss is completely buried or whether it sticks through some of the burial treatments, which is very important. A similar problem of detail and clarity affected reading of the discussion but to a lesser extent, and the final parts of the discussion were much clearer. My suggestion for this paper is that the language and content should be revised with the aim of achieving clarity and detail relating to the objectives set out, and this may involve changing the figures too. Focusing discussion more on the fitness and adaptations of the moss is likely to help, and replacing commonly used vague terminology like "positive" and "negative" effects with specific observations or interpretations like "reduced chlorophyll content" or "increased fitness" will help further. I think that the experimental work is well conceived and of good quality, but at present it is hard to be sure whether the conclusions are fully supported by the results. Specific comments below should help the authors see examples in the manuscript relating to the above suggestions:

Authors' response:

To improve the language of our manuscript we used the services of a European editing company (*International Science Editing Compuscript Ltd.*). The reviewer's comments have been addressed point by point to make the manuscript be more readable and understandable. In addition, we have carefully proof-read the manuscript to minimize typographical, grammatical, and bibliographical errors. We have revised the heading of Table 1 and the legends of Figure 2-5 as suggested, and from the data shown in Table 1, it has been made clear that the

mosses within the biocrust were only partially buried by sand when the burial was shallow (depth ≤ 2 mm), while, the mosses were completely buried at a burial depth ≥ 4 mm.

We agree that the use of specific observations or interpretations such as "reduced chlorophyll content" or "increased fitness" will help increase the clarity of the results, and have used similar phrases in the revised manuscript where appropriate. Because the major objective/focus of this study was to explore the interaction between drought and sand burial on biocrust moss, i.e., to determine if their interaction is additive or antagonistic, the terminology "positive" and "negative" effects has still been used where relevant.. We have made many modifications in to the Results section to make the text more understandable.

Referee's comment:

8 "highest" is suggestive of being superior. Perhaps "latest" would be better?

45 Again use of "highest" does not seem appropriate

Authors' response:

We agree and have replaced "highest" with "latest" in L8 and L46.

Referee's comment:

11 surely this is a very large niche, not small as stated

Authors' response:

We agree and have replaced "small" with "very large" in L11.

Referee's comment:

58 is there a reference to support this?

Authors' response:

We have added a reference, "Li et al., 2004", to support this statement.

Referee's comment:

63 is there a reference to support this (that *B. argenteum* is usually the pioneer)?

Authors' response:

This finding was obtained from our recent field investigation conducted throughout China's desert area, which will be presented in our next paper. To the best of our knowledge, there is no published reference in English to support this.

Referee's comment:

70 "buried" perhaps a better word than "submerged"

Authors' response:

We agree and have replaced "submerged" with "buried" in L72.

Referee's comment:

72-76 here setting out the importance of understanding how *B. argenteum* survives these multiple stressors as a main theme in the work - an interesting objective with practical applications.

Authors' response:

We agree, although we are convinced that the original sentences are sufficient to express the required meaning, and therefore we have not added any new text.

Referee's comment:

85-90 it is stated that drought "protects" (benefit) and burial can "slow water loss" (benefit), so why are these then described as "mutually antagonistic" on line 87? In this context they are mutually beneficial. I think care is needed here (and earlier e.g. line 33) to note the difference between an apparently harsh environment (for humans) which is actually the niche for which certain biocrust organisms are adapted. Therefore, these harsh conditions are likely a requirement for life of the biocrust organisms being studied. Based on this one may reasonably assume that drought and burial are mutually beneficial for organisms adapted to live in this environment.

Authors' response:

Drought and sand burial are two common stressors that severely limit (even damage in most cases) the growth and distribution of biocrust moss. Here we want to show that they can also induce beneficial effects in some cases, which could potentially occur through the combination of some specific level of drought and a certain depth of sand burial.

Referee's comment:

94-99 unnecessary precision of environmental parameters. The time period for which these data relate should be given.

Authors' response:

We have added "Based on meteorological records from 1956 to 2003" in L98.

Referee's comment:

126 the year should be given (and on line 133)

Authors' response:

We have added "in 2013" in L131.

Referee's comment:

129 "below the ground surface" - where? In situ at the extraction place in the field, or somewhere else?

Authors' response:

We have added "and transferred to Water Balance Observation Site (about 1 km from the sampling site) at Shapotou Desert Research and Experiment Station, Chinese Academy of Sciences." in L128-129.

Referee's comment:

138 please explain the burial a bit more, and refer to this in the introduction and discussion too as appropriate. It is necessary to know whether the burial completely covers the moss, or whether it sticks up through the added sand. This has major implications for the interpretation and understanding of the work.

Authors' response:

We believe that burial phenomena can be easily and clearly envisaged from the data shown in Table 1 (similar to Jia et al., Soil Biol. Biochem., 40, 2827-2834, 2008; Mart ínez, Plant Ecol., 145, 209-219, 1999; Maun, M. A. Can. J. Bot., 7, 713-738, 1998; Maun, M. A. Coastal Dunes: Ecology and Management, Springer, 119-136, 2008.). The mosses within the biocrust were only partially buried by sand when the depth of burial was shallow (depth ≤ 2 mm), whereas, the mosses were completely buried when the burial depth ≥ 4 mm. To avoid any

misunderstanding, we have revised the heading of Table 1 to “Table 1. Changes in the percentage cover of Bryum argenteum Hedw. within a biocrust in response to sand burial depth in spring and autumn.”.

Referee’s comment:

143 The experiment duration seems rather short but nothing can be done about that now. Perhaps the duration can be explained / justified?

Authors’ response:

Yes, 72 d is a short duration for each season. We did our best to ensure that the duration of the experiment was as close to the actual duration of each season, and to keep the duration identical in both spring and autumn, but we are convinced that the duration attained was sufficient to justify the conclusions of the study.

Referee’s comment:

147 Would deposited sand be naturally blown off in the field? The answer to this is of interest in relation to how the moss adapts to burial. If the deposit is never blown off then the moss needs to abandon the buried chlorophyll and invest in the tip, however if it might be blown off then it would make sense to retain the buried chlorophyll for a while in-case it will be exposed later.

Authors’ response:

Yes, sand deposited above the biocrust moss can be blown off under field conditions. We have discussed this in L357-358 in the Discussion section.

Referee’s comment:

152 A nice idea to minimise the edge effect.

159 Not clear if "shoot elongation" is the same as "shoot upgrowth" on line 157 – if same then please use same terminology, if different then please explain.

Authors’ response:

For biocrust moss under sand burial, according to our observations, "shoot elongation" and "shoot upgrowth" have the same meaning.

Referee’s comment:

166 Again nice attention to detail in the experimental method here (randomising positions)

185 I think the unit is wrong here

Authors’ response:

We have replaced “g” with “rpm” in L187-188.

Referee’s comment:

211 and throughout results section: It is not clear what negative and positive effects are. Instead, just state which measurements changed and how they changed (e.g. decrease or increase in chlorophyll content). In general I found the results section quite difficult to follow because of this. Furthermore in some cases the language used unclear phrases (e.g. "decrease in autumn being significantly lower" line 206). There is some interpretation in results which should instead be in discussion.

Authors’ response:

To make the text clearer, we revised the original sentences to “Drought uniformly imposed negative effects (the

*slopes of the fitted lines were negative) on the chlorophyll a content (Fig. 2a, b), whereas burial by sand had a dual effect (the slopes of the fitted lines exhibited both positive and negative values) on the chlorophyll a content (Fig. 2c, d).”in L215-217, “Drought consistently exerted negative effects (the slopes of the fitted lines were negative) on the PSII photochemical efficiency (Fig. 3a, b), while burial by sand had a dual effect (the slopes of the fitted lines showed both positive and negative values) on the PSII photochemical efficiency (Fig. 3c, d).”in L229-232, “Drought imposed negative effects (the slopes of the fitted lines were negative) on the regeneration potential of detached shoots of *B. argenteum* (Fig. 4a), while burial by sand had a dual effect (the slopes of the fitted lines displayed both positive and negative values) on the regeneration potential (Fig. 4b).” in L242-244 and “Although *B. argenteum* shoots were generally less elongated in spring than that under the same treatment in autumn, drought and sand burial, according to the slope values of the corresponding fitted lines, had both negative and dual effects on shoot elongation, respectively” in L252-253. In addition, we replaced “decrease” with “amplitude decrease” in L209.*

Referee’s comment:

284-286 I’m not sure if the effects observed have explained the moss distribution as claimed. Perhaps more explanation of this needed, or remove.

Authors’ response:

To be more accurate, we replaced “pattern of” with “survival and” in L293.

Referee’s comment:

288 The discussion here is interesting, effectively summarising findings for the most part but still a bit confusing in relation to what is a positive or negative, which seems to partly contradict the introductory section e.g. lines 85-90

Authors’ response:

*We think that there is no contradiction and any confusion can be explained as follows. The few studies referred to in the Introduction section showed that drought and sand burial can separately impose only one-way, beneficial effects on a biocrust moss, as well as intuitively causing harm. While, this study showed that, drought and sand burial on their own had more complex, dual effects in most cases, the beneficial and detrimental effects caused by either factor alone can emerge simultaneously and vary with the changes in the severity of drought or depth of burial. The combination of these factors indisputably leads to more complicated effects on biocrust moss. We are convinced that we have clearly indicated the single or interactive influences on *B. argenteum* for every parameter tested.*

Referee’s comment:

370-374 this is a clear and useful outcome of the work. Probably best not to mention the un-published results though.

Authors’ response:

We have deleted the sentence with the un-published results.

Referee’s comment:

380 This section also presenting clear and useful findings

Table 1. The precision to 3dp seems excessive, making it less clear

Authors' response:

We have redrawn Table 1 to make it clearer.

Referee's comment:

Figures 2-5. These are quite complicated and can't be fully understood based on the legend. For instance what is Control, 0.5mm, 1mm etc written at the top? What are the units or scale of drought severity? These details may be elsewhere but it should be possible to interpret the figures alone. I think some work is needed to make these a bit clearer, or if not possible consider using them as supplementary figures and replace with something less detailed which is easier to interpret.

Authors' response:

To improve the clarity and ease of understandability for reader, we have revised the legends of Figures 2-5, as shown below:

Figure 2. *Changes in the chlorophyll a content of the biocrust moss *Bryum argenteum* Hedw. following exposure to combinations of single (receiving the natural precipitation amount, control), double (receiving 1/2 of the natural precipitation amount) and fourfold (receiving 1/4 of the natural precipitation amount) drought and 0 (control), 0.5, 1, 2, 4, and 10 mm depths of sand burial in spring (a, c) and autumn (b, d). Bars represent means (\pm SE). Different letters indicate significant differences between different drought severities and sand burial depth treatments at the $p < 0.05$ level, as determined using a least significant difference (LSD) post-hoc test.*

Figure 3. *Changes in the PSII photochemical efficiency (F_v/F_m) of the biocrust moss *Bryum argenteum* Hedw. following exposure to combinations of single (receiving the natural precipitation amount, control), double (receiving 1/2 of the natural precipitation amount) and fourfold (receiving 1/4 of the natural precipitation amount) drought and 0 (control), 0.5, 1, 2, 4, and 10 mm depths of sand burial in spring (a, c) and autumn (b, d). Bars represent means (\pm SE). Different letters indicate significant differences between different drought severities and sand burial depth treatments at the $p < 0.05$ level as determined using a least significant difference (LSD) post-hoc test in spring and autumn.*

Figure 4. *Changes in the protonemal area of detached shoots of biocrust moss *Bryum argenteum* Hedw. following exposure to combinations of single (receiving the natural precipitation amount, control), double (receiving 1/2 of the natural precipitation amount) and fourfold (receiving 1/4 of the natural precipitation amount) drought and 0 (control), 0.5, 1, 2, 4, and 10 mm depths of sand burial in spring. Bars represent means (\pm SE). Different letters indicate significant differences between different drought severities and sand burial depth treatments at the $p < 0.05$ level as determined using a least significant difference (LSD) post-hoc test.*

Figure 5. *Changes in the maximal shoot elongation of biocrust moss *Bryum argenteum* Hedw. following exposure to combinations of single (receiving the natural precipitation amount, control), double (receiving 1/2 of the natural precipitation amount) and fourfold (receiving 1/4 of the natural precipitation amount) drought and 0 (control), 0.5, 1, 2, 4, and 10 mm depths of sand burial in spring (a, c) and autumn (b, d). Bars represent means (\pm SE). Different letters indicate significant differences between different drought severities and sand*

burial depth treatments at the $p < 0.05$ level as determined using a least significant difference (LSD) post-hoc test.

In addition, Figure 4 was replaced with the correct figure.

Part C: Authors' response to comments of Associate Editor

Referee's comment:

As a title of your manuscript, I would suggest "Antagonistic effects of drought and sand burial enable survival of biocrust moss *Bryum argenteum* in an arid sandy desert"

Authors' response:

*We agree and have revised the title of our manuscript to "Antagonistic effects of drought and sand burial enable survival of biocrust moss *Bryum argenteum* in an arid sandy desert".*

A list of all relevant changes made in the manuscript

1. Title: changed to “Antagonistic effects of drought and sand burial enable survival of biocrust moss *Bryum argenteum* in an arid sandy desert”.

2. Key words: Added “antagonistic effect, drought, sand burial, *Bryum argenteum*”.

3. Authors and affiliations: We would like to add Yixuan Li as the last author in the authorship list, as suggested by Rongliang Jia and approved by other co-authors, considering Li’s contributions to our experiment, data processing, manuscript writing and revising.

4. Abstract section:

1) We have replaced the old sentence to “It can represent the latest succession stage among the diverse range of surface-dwelling cryptogams (e.g., cyanobacteria, green algae, and lichen, which are also referred to as biocrusts) and it can make a major contribution to soil stability and fertility in many arid sandy desert ecosystems” in L8-11.

2) We have replaced “small” with “very large” in L11.

5. Introduction section:

1) We have replaced “increases” with “increase” in L34.

2) We have replaced the old sentence to “It can represent the latest succession stage among the diverse range of surface-dwelling cryptogams (e.g., cyanobacteria, green algae, and lichen, which are also referred to as biocrusts) and make a major contribution to soil stability and fertility in many arid and semiarid sandy desert ecosystems” in L45-48..

3) We have added a reference, “Li et al., 2004” L56.

4) We agree and have replaced “submerged” with “buried” in L70.

6. Materials and methods section:

1) We have added “Based on meteorological records from 1956 to 2003” in L96.

2) We have added “in 2013” in L129.

3) We have added “and transferred to Water Balance Observation Site (about 1 km from the sampling site) at Shapotou Desert Research and Experiment Station, Chinese Academy of Sciences.” in L126-127.

4) We have replaced “g” with “rpm” in L185-186.

7. Results section:

1) We have added “amplitude decrease” in L207.

2) We have revised the original sentences to “Drought uniformly imposed negative effects (the slopes of the fitted lines were negative) on the chlorophyll a content (Fig. 2a, b), whereas burial by sand had a dual effect (the slopes of the fitted lines exhibited both positive and negative values) on the chlorophyll a content (Fig. 2c, d).” in L213-215.

3) We have revised the original sentences to “Drought consistently exerted negative effects (the slopes of the fitted lines were negative) on the PSII photochemical efficiency (Fig. 3a, b), while burial by sand had a dual effect (the slopes of the fitted lines showed both positive and negative values) on the PSII photochemical

efficiency (Fig. 3c, d).”in L227-230.

4) We have revised the original sentences to “Drought imposed negative effects (the slopes of the fitted lines were negative) on the regeneration potential of detached shoots of *B. argenteum* (Fig. 4a), while burial by sand had a dual effect (the slopes of the fitted lines displayed both positive and negative values) on the regeneration potential (Fig. 4b).” in L240-242

5) We have revised the original sentences to “Although *B. argenteum* shoots were generally less elongated in spring than that under the same treatment in autumn, drought and sand burial, according to the slope values of the corresponding fitted lines, had both negative and dual effects on shoot elongation, respectively” in L251-253.

8. Discussion section:

1) We have replaced “*B. argenteum* Hedw. usually” with “*Bryum argenteum* Hedw. generally”.

2) To be more accurate, we have replaced “pattern of” with “survival and” in L291.

3) We have deleted the sentence “The results of our latest pilot experiment (unpublished) support this proposition.” before “The use of such a technique is also in agreement with Maestre et al. (2006)” in L380.

9. Acknowledgments section: We have added “We gratefully acknowledge Bettina Weber, David Elliott and one anonymous reviewer for their invaluable comments on the manuscript.” in L398-399.

10. References section: We have replaced “outer” with “Outer” in L437.

11. Table 1: The heading of Table 1 was revised to avoid misunderstanding, and Table 1 was redrawn to make it clearer.

12. Figures:

1) The legends of Figures 2-5 were revised to improve the clarity and ease of understandability.

2) Figure 4 was replaced with the correct figure.

~~The mutually antagonistic effects~~ of drought and sand burial enables survival ~~theof~~ biocrust moss *Bryum argenteum* ~~Hedw. to survive the two co-occurring stressors in an arid sandy desert~~

Rongliang Jia¹, Yun Zhao¹, Yanhong Gao¹, Rong Hui¹, Haotian Yang¹, Zenru Wang¹, Yixuan Li²

¹Shapotou Desert Research and Experiment Station, Northwest Institute of Eco-Environment and Resources, Chinese Academy of Sciences, 320 Donggang West Road, Lanzhou 730000, China.

²Agronomy College, Agricultural University of Shenyang, Shenyang 110866, China

Correspondence to: Rongliang Jia (rongliangjia@163.com)

Abstract. Biocrust moss is an essential soil surface bio-cover. It can ~~represents~~ the highest-latest ~~succession~~ stage among the diverse range of surface-dwelling cryptogams (e.g., cyanobacteria, green algae, and lichen, which are also referred to as biological soil crusts) and it can ~~makes~~ a major contribution to soil stability and fertility ~~throughout in many arid sandy~~ desert ecosystems. The soil surface represents a small-very large ~~ecological niche~~ that is poikilohydric in nature. Biocrust moss is therefore highly susceptible to drought and sand burial, which are two ubiquitous stressors in arid sandy deserts. However, little information is available regarding the mechanism by which biocrust moss can survive and flourish in these habitats when stressed simultaneously by the two stressors. The combined effects of drought and sand burial were evaluated in a field experiment using the predominant biocrust moss, *Bryum argenteum* Hedw., in the Tengger Desert, China. Drought was simulated by applying distilled water in three artificial rainfall regimes at 8-day intervals in spring and autumn: 4 and 6 mm (average rainfall, control), 2 and 3 mm (double drought), and 1 and 1.5 mm (fourfold drought), respectively. The effect of sand burial was determined by applying six treatments, i.e., sand depths of 0 (control), 0.5, 1, 2, 4, and 10 mm. The four parameters of chlorophyll a content, PSII photochemical efficiency, regeneration potential, and shoot upgrowth were evaluated in the moss. It was found that the combined effects of drought and sand burial did not exacerbate the single negative effects of the four parameters tested. Drought significantly ameliorated the negative effects of deep sand burial on the retention of

带格式的：上标

带格式的：非上标/下标

25 chlorophyll a content, PSII photochemical efficiency, and regeneration potential of *B. argenteum*. Sand burial
diminished and even reversed the negative effects of drought on the maintenance of chlorophyll a content, PSII
photochemical efficiency, and regeneration potential. Although drought and sand burial imposed an additive
negative effect on shoot upgrowth, which suggested a trade-off between growth ability and stress tolerance,
their mutually antagonistic effect on the physiological vigor of *B. argenteum* provided an opportunity for the
30 biocrust moss to overcome the two co-occurring stressors. In addition to providing a strong stress tolerance,
drought and sand burial may provide an important mechanism for the biodiversity maintenance of biocrust
mosses in arid sandy ecosystems.

Key words: antagonistic effect, drought, sand burial, *Bryum argenteum*

1 Introduction

35 Drought is the most common stressor constraining biological activity in dryland ecosystems (Whitford, 2002;
Huxman et al., 2004). The predicted increases in the frequency and severity of droughts is likely to generate
more profound consequences for community structure and ecosystem functioning in arid and semiarid
ecosystems (IPCC, 2007; Smith, 2011; Weber et al., 2016). In arid sandy ecosystems, drought generally occurs
40 alongside another ubiquitous disturbance, sand burial, due to the lowering of the threshold friction velocities of
the upper soil surface (Belnap and Gillette, 1998; Li, 2012). Sand burial can alter various physical factors such
as moisture, temperature, aeration, and other aspects of the plant and soil micro-environment. It can therefore
act as a filter eliminating sensitive species, and it plays a significant role in determining the composition and
distribution of desert vegetation (Maun, 1998, 2008). Therefore, in habitats stressed simultaneously by drought
and sand burial (e.g., arid desert ecosystems) throughout China and worldwide, the growth and distribution of
45 plants is expected to be limited. This is evidenced by mobile sand dunes, with negligible vegetation cover as an
extreme example.

Biocrust moss is an essential soil surface bio-cover. It ~~can represent~~ the ~~highest-latest~~ succession stage
among the diverse range of surface-dwelling cryptogams (e.g., cyanobacteria, green algae, and lichen, which
are also referred to as biological-soil-crusts) and makes a major contribution to soil stability and fertility

50 | ~~throughout in many~~ arid and semiarid ~~sandy~~ desert ecosystems (Weber et al., 2016). The colonization and development of moss on the surface of a sand dune is an important biomarker denoting the ecosystem as being stable and healthy (Zhang et al., 2010). Thus, the assessment, protection, and utilization of moss is a major management priority in desert regions (Stark et al., 2004; Barker et al., 2005; Xu et al., 2009; Doherty et al., 2015).

55 | Since the 1950s, large-scale construction and land restoration has occurred throughout the arid and semiarid sandy areas of north China, with the aims of inhibiting the harmful effects of mobile sand movement and recovering degraded ecosystems. One striking success has been the Shapotou revegetation system, which was constructed to alleviate burial stress using combined applications of wind barriers, straw checkerboards, and planting anti-drought shrubs without irrigation (Li et al., 2004, as shown in Fig. 1). Sixty years later, along with the succession of vegetation, biocrust biota have gradually colonized the area and now thrive on the previously bare soil surface, where they constitute more than 90% of the living ground cover. As a pioneer moss species, *Bryum argenteum* Hedw. dominates the soil surface in this system, with a coverage exceeding 70% and making a major contribution to soil stability and fertility. Its role is particularly important in areas where the sand-binding role of previously planted shrubs has weakened with time (Li et al., 2004). This phenomenon is evident throughout other sandy desert ecosystems restored by similar methods in China, where *B. argenteum* usually appears as the pioneer moss species. Consequently, it needs to be understood why *B. argenteum* can survive and thrive in ecosystems stressed by both drought and sand burial, enabling it to be the pioneer species.

70 | Species that are poikilohydric in nature lack vascular support tissues, but usually protrude above the soil surface to receive light for photosynthesis. Also, they are completely immobile, which prevents them from finding refuge to avoid drought stresses (Garcia-Pichel and Belnap, 1996). *Bryum argenteum* responds negatively to drought, despite its high desiccation tolerance (e.g., Li et al., 2014). Because it grows on the surface, *B. argenteum* is inevitably exposed to repeated sand burial of various depths. Due to its limited height above the ground surface (1 to 25 mm) the moss can be completely ~~submerged-buried~~ even when the burial depth is shallow (Jia et al., 2008). This has generated multiple organic horizons of “fossilized mosses” in areas

75 where it has survived burial stress and barren spaces where it has not (Jia et al., 2008). Therefore, there must be
a mechanism for *B. argenteum* to adapt to and survive this combination of stressors, although it remains poorly
understood. A clear understanding of the mechanism enabling *B. argenteum* to survive the co-occurring drought
and sand burial stressors in desert areas would help to explain the distribution mechanisms of this common
species. It would also enable us to predict the consequences of climate change and to formulate management
80 policies and restoration practices using biocrust moss to stabilize and rehabilitate degraded flowing sandy
dunes.

Previous studies have principally focused on the individual effects of drought (Stark et al., 2004; Barker et
al., 2005; Xu et al., 2009) and sand burial (Jia et al., 2008) as stressors on desert biocrust mosses, with little
emphasis on their combination and even less on their interaction. Considering the different and even contrasting
85 effects of drought and sand burial on physiology and growth, it is of interest to determine if a combination of
drought and sand burial imposes a mutually antagonistic effect on the physiology and growth of *B. argenteum*,
enabling it to survive the two co-occurring stressors. Drought is reported to protect moss from heat shock (Xu
et al., 2009) and ultraviolet-B induced damage (Turnbull et al., 2009), while sand burial has been reported to
slow water loss from moss crusts (Meng et al., 2011). Therefore, our initial hypothesis is that the combination
90 of drought and sand burial has a mutually antagonistic effect on the physiology, regeneration, and growth of *B.*
argenteum. To test this hypothesis, multiple assessments of the single and combined effects of drought and sand
burial stresses were made, including measurements of the chlorophyll a content, PSII fluorescence,
regeneration potential, and growth rate.

95 **2 Materials and methods**

2.1 Study site

The study area was located in the southeastern fringe of the Tengger Desert (37° 28' N, 105° 00' E,
elevation 1,339 m). It lies within the transitional zone from desert steppe to steppified desert and also represents
a transitional belt between desert and oasis. [Based on meteorological records from 1956 to 2003, ~~The~~ the](#) mean

100 annual temperature is 10.6 °C, with the minimum temperature being -25.1 °C in January and the maximum being
38.1 °C in July. The mean annual pan potential evaporation is around 3,000 mm, while the mean annual
precipitation is 180.2 mm, more than half of which falls in summer (June-August). The other three seasons
typically experience more drought periods. The landscape of the study region consisted of large and dense
reticulate barchan chains of sand dunes, where the predominant native plants were *Hedysarum scoparium* Fisch.
105 and *Agriophyllum squarrosum* Moq. that together covered about 1% of the ground surface. No biocrust was
found on the surface of the mobile sand dunes (Li, 2012).

A no-irrigation vegetation system was established in 1956 to protect Baotou-Lanzhou railway line from sand
burial. It consisted of straw-checkerboards as sand barriers to fix shifting dunes, with the subsequent planting of
xerophytic shrub seedlings (*Caragana korshinskii*, *Artemisia ordosica*, *Calligonum arborescens*, etc.). The
110 system was further expanded in 1964, 1981, and 1987. These vegetated areas were distributed parallel to the
railway line, with a length of 16 km and a width of 1–2 km (Li et al., 2004). The initial shrub vegetation was
gradually replaced by communities dominated by herbaceous plants due to the decreasing soil water content in
the upper soil layers (Li et al., 2004). Biocrust biota then colonized and developed on the stabilized dunes,
which resulted in the surface becoming increasingly stabilized. As a pioneer species, *B. argenteum* successfully
115 colonized the revegetated area and became widespread, with a coverage exceeding 70% on windward slopes
and low lying sand dunes. Although there is a gradual reduction in sand burial stress on the growth of *B.*
argenteum as the biocrust moss becomes established, it is inevitably exposed to repeated wind-blown sand
events, leading to dust burial of various depths. This burial is typically caused by two different processes that
are seasonal in their severity. In spring, when the wind speed is usually the highest and drought is most severe
120 (precipitation is the lowest), burial by wind-blown sand predominates. In summer and autumn, when the
drought is slightly alleviated by higher levels of precipitation, animal activity (burrowing by ants, lizards, and
rabbits) becomes important.

2.2 Sampling and treatments

125 | Samples of intact moss crusts (85 cm², 10-cm thick); with 100% coverage of *B. argenteum* were randomly
collected using cylindrical PVC dishes (104-mm diameter, 12-cm height). At the base of each dish there was a
drainage outlet that was covered with strips of nylon mesh to allow excess water to be removed, while
preventing the loss of sand. All samples were collected from the interspaces between shrubs in the revegetated
area that was established in 1981 and transferred to Water Balance Observation Site (about 1 km from the
130 | sampling site) at Shapotou Desert Research and Experiment Station, Chinese Academy of Sciences. Sampling
was conducted in late February and late August, which was about 10 days before the experiments began in
spring and autumn in 2013, respectively. Samples were gently processed and sprayed with distilled water to
ensure they were moist and that the sample structure remained intact. All samples were placed below the
ground surface, with the top 2 cm left aboveground. Rain shelters were then placed at a height of 2 m above the
135 | samples. The soil surfaces surrounding the samples were paved with a straw curtain, which extended for 5 m
beyond the shade of the shelters to prevent disturbance from sand particles outside the study area.

Drought and sand burial stress treatments were conducted from 10 March (spring) and 1 September (autumn),
respectively. A total of 108 samples were collected for each experiment in the two different seasons and were
randomly divided into three water supply groups by applying distilled water in three artificial rainfall regimes
140 | at 8-day intervals in spring and autumn: 4 and 6 mm (average rainfall, control), 2 and 3 mm (double drought),
and 1 and 1.5 mm (fourfold drought), respectively. To determine the effect of burial, six treatments were
applied, with depths of 0 (control), 0.5, 1, 2, 4, and 10 mm, equivalent to 0, 4.25, 8.5, 17, 34, and 85 ml of dried
sand, respectively. The sand was distributed gently and evenly over crusts that had been subjected to each of the
water-supply subgroups described above.

145 | There were six replicates of the drought × sand burial treatment. The prescribed sand burial depths and
quantities of water applied were selected based on actual sand burial depths and precipitation levels observed
during the period of 1990-2010 (Li et al., 2012) in the study area. The duration of each experiment was 72 d.

2.3 Measurements of the chlorophyll a content, PSII photochemical efficiency, regeneration potential,

150 **and maximal shoot upgrowth**

On the day after each experiment was completed, the sand particles deposited over the moss were gently blown off and the same weight of sand applied prior to the burial treatment was collected. The upper 26 mm (i.e., including the active moss rhizoids) and inner core (5-cm diameter) were excavated from each original sample and placed into cylindrical plastic dishes (5-cm diameter, 28-mm height). Each dish had a drainage outlet at the bottom that was covered with a strip of nylon mesh to allow excess moisture to be removed. These smaller samples were more representative than the original samples because the edge effect of the PVC tube was removed.

The six small samples from each treatment were randomly divided into two subgroups, one for the determination of maximal shoot upgrowth, PSII photochemical efficiency, and regeneration potential, and the other for the measurement of the chlorophyll a content of *B. argenteum*. The methods used to measure the maximal shoot upgrowth, PSII photochemical efficiency, regeneration potential, and chlorophyll a content of samples were adopted from Jia et al. (2012).

The maximal shoot elongation of *B. argenteum* was determined by the difference between the vertical distances from the upper edge of the PVC container to the uppermost part of the crust surface prior to sand burial and after removal from the sand at the end of the experiment using a Vernier caliper.

The samples were watered to saturation level and then cultured in a growth chamber (Thermoline Scientific Equipment Pty. Ltd, NSW, Australia). The photon flux density (PFD), air temperature (T_a), relative air humidity (RH), and CO_2 concentration (Ca) was set to $1,000 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, 25°C , 55%, and $390 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, respectively, during the day (0800-1900 h), and $0 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, 15°C , 65%, and $400 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, respectively, at night (1900-0800 h the next day). The position of each sample was randomly changed every day. After a 3-d pre-acclimation, the samples were wetted again to saturation level and PSII photochemical efficiency was measured 4 h later (when the maximum value occurred). The PSII photochemical efficiency (F_v/F_m) was determined by an analysis of the slow kinetics of chlorophyll fluorescence using a PAM-2000 fluorometer (Walz, Effeltrich, Germany). The device was adjusted to maintain a distance of 1.20 cm between the fiber optics exit

175 plane and sample. Prior to measurement, the samples were dark adapted for 5 min and then supplemented with a
sequence of weak irradiance and saturation pulses ($5,000 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$).

These samples were then hydrated, washed, and shaken to remove any sand attached. Then, 1 mm-long
portions of the upper shoots containing stem apices were isolated from each of the smaller samples and placed
on native sand that had previously been sieved and dried as described by Stark et al. (2004). The same
180 cylindrical plastic dishes as in the previous experiment were used, and the experimental conditions were also
the same, except that moisture was supplied daily. The protonemal area was determined according to the
protocols described by Barker et al. (2005) after a 58-d inoculation. The measurement of the regeneration
potential of detached shoots was only conducted in the spring experiment, due to some of the autumn
experiment samples being broken during transportation.

185 The chlorophyll a content was determined on a mg g^{-1} dry weight basis by high performance liquid
chromatography (HPLC) using a method described by Gilmore and Yamamoto (1991). Briefly, 50 mg of dry,
soil-free shoots were collected from each sample, ground, extracted in 80% acetone, and then centrifuged at
10,000 ~~rpm~~ for 5 min. After removal of the supernatant, the remaining pellet was resuspended in 100% acetone
and centrifuged again at 10,000 ~~rpm~~. The supernatants were then mixed and passed through a 20-mm filter prior
190 to injection into a Spherisorb ODS 1 column (Alltech Associates Inc., Deerfield, IL, USA) at a flow rate of 1 cm.

2.4 Statistics

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test for any significant differences in the data using
the SPSS 21 software (SPSS Inc., Chicago, USA). Differences between the individual parameters were
195 evaluated by least significant difference (LSD) post-hoc multiple comparisons at the 95% confidence level.

Linear regressions were performed in the ORIGIN 8.5 (OriginLab, Northampton, USA) to depict any trends
in the chlorophyll a content, PSII photochemical efficiency, regeneration potential of detached moss shoots, and
maximal shoot elongation to increases in drought severity /burial depth.

A detrended correspondence analysis (DCA) of the chlorophyll a content, PSII photochemical efficiency,

200 regeneration potential (protonemal area), and shoot upgrowth of *B. argenteum* was used to determine whether
linear or unimodal ordination methods should be applied. We then performed a redundancy analysis (RDA) to
determine the relationships between the parameters listed above and environmental parameters. A Monte Carlo
permutation test (n = 499) was used to determine the significance of all canonical axes. Both DCA and RDA
were performed using Canoco for windows 5.0 (Ithaca, NY, USA).

3 Results

3.1 Seasonal changes in *B. argenteum* cover and its response to sand burial depth

205 *Bryum argenteum* can completely cover a soil surface, and there was no significant difference between spring
and autumn cover when sand burial was absent (Table 1). Sand burial significantly reduced the *B. argenteum*
210 cover in both seasons, with the amplitude decrease in autumn being significantly lower than that in spring
(Table 1).

3.2 Interactive effects of sand burial and drought on the chlorophyll a content of *B. argenteum*

215 The chlorophyll a content of *B. argenteum* was generally lower in spring than under the same treatment in
autumn, with the same trend found in the response to drought, sand burial, and their combination (Fig. 2).
Drought uniformly imposed negative effects (the slopes of the fitted lines were negative) on the chlorophyll a
content (Fig. 2a, b), whereas burial by sand had a dual effect (the slopes of the fitted lines exhibited both
positive and negative values) on the chlorophyll a content (Fig. 2c, d). The chlorophyll a content increased in
220 treatments when the burial depth was shallow (< 2 mm) and decreased when the depth was larger (sand burial
depth ≥ 2 mm).

A significant interactive effect between drought and sand burial on the chlorophyll a content of *B. argenteum*
was found. Drought strengthened the positive effects of shallow burial and mediated the negative effects of
deep burial with regard to chlorophyll a retention (Fig. 2c, d). In addition, sand burial weakened and even
reversed the negative effects of drought on the retention of the chlorophyll a content in *B. argenteum* (Fig. 2a,

225 b).

3.3 Interactive effects of sand burial and drought on the PSII photochemical efficiency of *B. argenteum*

230 The PSII photochemical efficiency of *B. argenteum* displayed the same trends as the chlorophyll a content in response to drought, sand burial, and their combination, although it was generally lower in spring than under the same treatment in autumn (Fig. 3). Drought consistently exerted negative effects (the slopes of the fitted lines were negative) on the PSII photochemical efficiency (Fig. 3a, b), while burial by sand had a dual effect (the slopes of the fitted lines showed both positive and negative values) on the PSII photochemical efficiency (Fig. 3c, d). The PSII photochemical efficiency increased in treatments where the burial depth was shallow (< 2 mm) and decreased when the depth was larger (sand burial depth ≥ 2 mm).

235 A dramatic interactive effect between sand burial and drought on the PSII photochemical efficiency of *B. argenteum* was observed. Drought strengthened the positive effects of shallow burial and ameliorated the negative effects of deep burial with regard to PSII photochemical efficiency (Fig. 3c, d). Sand burial diminished and even reversed the negative effects of drought on the retention of the PSII photochemical efficiency (Fig. 3a, b).

240

3.4 Interactive effects of sand burial and drought on the regeneration potential of detached shoots of *B. argenteum*

245 Drought imposed negative effects (the slopes of the fitted lines were negative) on the regeneration potential of detached shoots of *B. argenteum* (Fig. 4a-b), while burial by sand had a dual effect (the slopes of the fitted lines displayed both positive and negative values) on the regeneration potential (Fig. 4b). The regeneration potential increased in treatments where the burial depth was shallow (< 2 mm) and to decrease when the depth was larger (sand burial depth ≥ 2 mm).

There was a remarkable interactive effect of sand burial and drought on the regeneration potential of *B. argenteum*. Sand burial alleviated and even converted the negative effects of drought into positive effects with

250 regard to the regeneration potential of detached shoots. Drought enhanced the positive effects of shallow burial
and eased the negative effects of deep burial on the regeneration potential of detached shoots.

3.5 Interactive effects of sand burial and drought on shoot elongation of *B. argenteum*

255 Although *B. argenteum* shoots were generally less elongated in spring than that under the same treatment in
autumn, drought and sand burial, according to the slope values of the corresponding fitted lines, had both
negative and dual effects on shoot elongation, respectively, which was similar to the pattern observed for the
other three parameters described above (Fig. 5). Conversely, drought reduced the positive effects of shallow
burial and exacerbated the negative effects of deep burial (Fig. 5c,d) on shoot upgrowth, respectively. In
addition, sand burial aggravated the negative effects of drought on shoot elongation (Fig. 5a, b).

260

3.6 Redundancy analysis of the combined effects of sand burial and drought on the chlorophyll a content, PSII photochemical efficiency, regeneration potential, and shoot upgrowth of *B. argenteum*

The RDA analysis results showed that drought was a more important stressor influencing shoot elongation than
sand burial (Fig. 6), while sand burial played a more important role in the retention of the chlorophyll a content,
265 PSII photochemical efficiency, and regeneration potential than drought. Specifically, sand burial was positively
correlated with the chlorophyll a content, PSII photochemical efficiency, regeneration potential, and shoot
elongation when the burial depth was shallow (< 2 mm, Fig. 6a), while it was negatively correlated with the
four variables when the depth was larger (sand burial depth ≥ 2 mm, Fig. 6b). In addition, drought was
negatively correlated with the four variables when the burial depth was shallow (< 2 mm, Fig. 6a), but
270 positively correlated with all variables, except for shoot elongation, when the depth was larger (sand burial
depth ≥ 2 mm, Fig. 6b).

The four parameters investigated in this study were more readily affected by sand burial and drought in
autumn than in spring when the burial depth was shallow (< 2 mm, Fig. 6a). Under deep sand burial (sand
burial depth ≥ 2 mm, Fig. 6b), the chlorophyll a content, PSII photochemical efficiency, and regeneration

带格式的：缩进：首行缩进：0字
符

275 potential were more sensitive to sand burial in autumn than in spring, but shoot elongation was more
susceptible to sand burial in spring than autumn. In contrast, the chlorophyll a content, PSII photochemical
efficiency, and regeneration potential were more sensitive to drought in spring than in autumn, while shoot
elongation was more susceptible to sand burial in autumn than spring under the deep sand burial treatments
(sand burial depth ≥ 2 mm, Fig. 6b).

280

4 Discussion

A desert is a multi-stressed environment, generally characterized by a series of stressors (Xie et al., 2007;
Powell et al., 2015). The biocrust moss, *Bryum- argenteum* Hedw. ~~usually~~generally acts as a pioneer, and even
dominant species, inhabiting many desert ecosystems due to its high resistance and versatile adaptation
285 strategies to stressors (Li et al., 2014; Weber et al., 2016). There is growing evidence that biocrust organisms,
including mosses, are extremely vulnerable to stressors originating mostly from climate change and
disturbances (Reed et al., 2012; Weber et al., 2016). Ferrenberg et al. (2015) found that climate change and
physical disturbances may cause similar community shifts within biocrusts. In arid sandy desert ecosystems,
drought and sand burial are the two prevailing stressors, and are induced separately by climate change and
290 disturbance. They act as filters, eliminating the sensitive species by determining the physiology, growth, and
survival of biocrust mosses (Mart ínez and Maun, 1999; Barker et al., 2005; Jia et al., 2008). In this study, we
found that drought and sand burial exerted different, but dual effects on the physiology and growth of *B.*
argenteum. More interestingly, both antagonistic and additive effects of drought and sand burial on *B.*
argenteum were observed (Fig. 6), which explained the ~~pattern-of-survival and~~ distribution of *B. argenteum* in
295 an arid sandy desert where the two stressors can occur simultaneously.

4.1 Mutually antagonistic effects between drought and sand burial enabled *B. argenteum* to survive the co-occurrence of the two stressors in an arid sandy desert

As hypothesized, it was found that a combination of sand burial and drought did not always exacerbate the

300 individual negative effects of each stressor on *B. argenteum*. Drought significantly ameliorated the negative effects of deep sand burial on PSII photochemical efficiency (Fig. 2), the retention of chlorophyll a content (Fig. 3), and regeneration potential (Fig. 4) of *B. argenteum*. Sand burial diminished and even reversed the negative effects of drought on the maintenance of the chlorophyll a content (Fig. 2), PSII photochemical efficiency (Fig. 3), and regeneration potential (Fig. 4) of *B. argenteum*. These mutually antagonistic effects on the physiological vigor of the biocrust moss provided an opportunity for it to overcome the two co-occurring stressors, and this
305 may be an important reason why it usually acts as the pioneer moss species by colonizing and even flourishing on the ground surface throughout China's sandy deserts.

The antagonistic effects of these two stressors are short-term physiological indicators, implying that *B. argenteum* has a strong potential to photosynthesize or regenerate after their removal. It is difficult for the moss
310 to maintain this potential for a long time due to the increased use or exhaustion of its stored carbohydrate reserves when buried (Maun, 1998; Kent et al., 2005). Therefore, other long-term parameters (e.g., growth rate) also need to be considered.

315 **4.2 Additive negative effects between drought and sand burial limit the distribution of *B. argenteum* in an arid sandy desert**

In contrast to our expectations, the mutually antagonistic effects of drought and sand burial did not impact on long-term shoot upgrowth, even though sand burial (depth ≤ 4 mm) stimulated shoot elongation (Fig. 5). This additive negative effect inflicted by the combination of drought and sand burial on shoot upgrowth suggested a trade-off between growth and stress tolerance (Steinberg, 2012). In general, there is a trade-off between growth
320 and physiological vigor, including regeneration potential, when the moss is exposed to stress. This is in accordance with the theory that adaptation to stress carries a cost, and spending resources on defense or resistance leads to a weakened performance in conditions where these traits are not needed (Bijlsma and Loeschcke, 2005). Collectively, the preservation of physiological activity (photosynthetic pigment, PSII photochemical efficiency) and the propagation of fecundity (protonemal area), afforded by the mutually antagonistic effects, at the cost of

325 shoot elongation caused by the negative additive effect, under long-term, deep sand burial, will result in the
failure of *B. argenteum* shoots to protrude above the sand surface. This could even lead to death, ultimately
causing the moss to vanish from the ecosystem. This can explain the absence of *B. argenteum* in areas suffering
from long-term, deep-sand-burial stress, such as flowing sand or seriously degraded landscapes. It also explains
why *B. argenteum* can colonize soil surfaces only after the burial depth decreases to a shallow level, through
330 ecological construction and restoration measures throughout the arid sandy areas of northern China.

Based on a conceptual model, Bowker et al. (2006) and Li et al. (2010) both proved that biocrust moss is
restricted to a specific topography, where it is less stressed from the microclimate and disturbances than at other
positions at micro-spatial scales. However, the distribution of *B. argenteum* is apparently vaster and more
continuous than that indicated by Bowker et al. (2006) and Li et al. (2010) in arid sandy areas, where sand
335 burial is pervasive and occurs regularly. Thus, it is suggested that the interaction between physical
environmental stressors from resource limitation, climate, and physical disturbances can be used to facilitate an
extension of the ecological niche of desert moss (Callaway, 1995). Therefore, corresponding models should
take into account the interactions between climate change and physical disturbances, and from an evolutionary
perspective the environmental pressure and biological response should be considered integratively. This study
340 also found that biocrust moss could be harmed by climate change, with conditions such as drought predicted to
be more frequent and extensive in the future. This damage may be alleviated by other environmental factors or
disturbances, such as sand burial, although this needs to be verified further.

345 **4.3 Possible mechanisms underlying the combined effects of drought and sand burial on *B. argenteum* and its significance in ecological construction**

It is not fully understood why drought and sand burial exert antagonistic effects on the physiological activity
and asexual propagating fecundity of *B. argenteum*. It is possible that the antagonistic effect may originate from
the water conserving effect of sand burial, which could mitigate the negative effect of drought to some extent
(Meng et al., 2011). For over 300 years in China, sand burial has been widely used by farmers as a useful

350 moisture-conserving measure to cultivate crops, in a practice referred to as Shatian or sandy field (Li et al.,
2000). However, this beneficial effect has rarely been reported for biocrust mosses. In addition, sand burial can
also provide a protective shell for *B. argenteum*, mitigating the damage from other stresses, such as wind (Liu et
al., 2013). On the other hand, drought favors *B. argenteum* under sand burial by lowering the risk of carbon
starvation induced by the reduction of photosynthetic area and the relatively trivial rainfall (causing the partial
355 hydration of moss). This favorable effect of drought has also been reported for bundled filamentous
cyanobacteria following sand burial (Williams, 2011; Rao et al., 2012) or thermal stress (Lan et al., 2014), and
mosses exposed to heat shock (Xu et al., 2009), ultraviolet-B (Turnbull et al., 2009), and fungal attack (Weber
et al., 2016). Drought would increase the removal rate of sand by enabling the dry sand to be more easily blown
by wind, resulting in a harmful deep burial becoming a beneficial shallow burial. Therefore, drought is also
360 considered to have a dual effect, especially when deep sand burial occurs.

The ability to achieve a higher rate of shoot elongation gives *B. argenteum* an important advantage over
other moss species, enabling it to rapidly recover from sand burial (Jia et al., 2008). However, shoot elongation
in *B. argenteum* is severely inhibited by drought, due to the lower amounts (Jia et al., 2008) and/or shorter
durations (Kidron et al., 2010) of moisture availability. This could be interpreted as a reduction in the
365 accumulation of carbohydrate gained by photosynthesis or as carbon starvation (Barker et al., 2005) caused by
drought. Sand burial not only directly reduces the photosynthetic area of mosses, but also causes a deterioration
in the environmental conditions required for photosynthesis (e.g., reduction of photosynthetically active
radiation and blocking gas exchange). Furthermore, the sand deposited on *B. argenteum* would intercept water
from precipitation, decreasing the quantity of rainfall available to the moss, with the trivial amount of
370 precipitation received already identified as being detrimental (induce carbon starvation) to biocrust moss
(Alpert and Oechel, 1985; Belnap et al., 2004). This would consolidate the negative effect of drought on the
shoot elongation of *B. argenteum*.

In recent years, the rapid artificial cultivation of biocrust has provided a novel alternative to traditional
biological methods for controlling erosion (Bu et al., 2014; Doherty et al., 2015; Antoninka et al., 2016). At the

375 same time, biocrust moss is considered to be a potentially promising biological material that could be
inoculated to accelerate the process of sand fixation and the recovery of degraded soil (Antoninka et al., 2016).
However, this technique is still limited to laboratory trials, with no successful large-scale application in the
field reported. One key reason for this is that the moss typically occupies the late successional stage among
biocrusts and its environmental requirements are high. The moss cultured in the laboratory under favorable
380 conditions cannot withstand the unfavorable stress from drought, high temperature, and UV-B exposure.
However, the results of this study indicate that moderate sand burial may have the potential to alleviate these
stresses and increase the survival ratio of artificially cultured biocrust moss in the restoration of arid sandy
deserts or degraded ecosystems. ~~The results of our latest pilot experiment (unpublished) support this
proposition.~~The use of such a technique is also in agreement with Maestre et al. (2006), who found that the
385 inoculation of biocrusts in the form of a slurry combined with the addition of composted sewage sludge, which
has a similar effect to that of burial, encouraged the recovery of biocrust in degraded soils from semiarid
Mediterranean areas.

4.4 Seasonal effects on the combined effects of drought and sand burial on *B. argenteum*

390 Coverage (Table 1), physiological vigor (Fig. 2, 3), and growth rate (Fig. 4) of *B. argenteum* and the response to
drought and sand burial varied with season (Fig. 5). In our study area, the physiological activity of *B.*
argenteum reached its lowest level after a long-term cold and drought stress in winter (Li et al., 2012).
Conserving its activity in the continuous-drought of spring; enabled the moss to be ready to obtain more carbon
through photosynthesis in the relatively favorable conditions in summer (higher precipitation). In autumn, when
395 the physiological activity of *B. argenteum* was highest, it is essential to gain height through shoot upgrowth to
cope with the following sand burial in winter. This successful seasonal adaptation strategy of *B. argenteum* to
the co-occurring stressors of drought and sand burial was supported by our results. Therefore, the seasonal
distribution of precipitation and sand burial in our study area was important because it enabled *B. argenteum* to
be the pioneer species in our study area, and this mechanism may be valid in areas suffering from the

400 co-occurring stressors of drought and sand burial in sandy deserts elsewhere in China and worldwide.

Acknowledgments. [We gratefully acknowledge Bettina Weber, David Elliott and one anonymous reviewer for their invaluable comments on the manuscript.](#) This research was partially supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 41371099, 41671210, 41621001) and CAS "Light of West China" Program.

405

References

Alpert, P., Oechel, W. C.: Carbon balance limits microdistribution in the desiccation-tolerant plant, *Grimmia laevigata*, *Ecology*, 66, 660-669, 1985.

Antoninka, A., Bowker, M. A., and Reed, S. C., Doherty, K.: Production of greenhouse-grown biocrust mosses and associated cyanobacteria to rehabilitate dryland soil function, *Restor Ecol*, 24(3), 324-35, 2016.

410 Barker, D. H., Stark, L. R., Zimpfer, J. F., Mcletchie, N. D., and Smith, S. D.: Evidence of drought-induced stress on biotic crust moss in the Mojave Desert, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 28, 939-947, 2005.

Belnap, J., Gillette, D. A.: Vulnerability of desert biological soil crusts to wind erosion: the influences of crust development, soil texture, and disturbance. *J. Arid Environ.*, 39, 133-142, 1998.

415 Belnap, J., Phillips, S. L., and Miller, M. E.: Response of desert biological soil crusts to alterations in precipitation frequency, *Oecologia*, 141: 306-316, doi: 10.1007/s00442-003-1438-6, 2004.

Bijlsma, R., Loeschcke, V.: Environmental stress, adaptation and evolution: an overview, *J. Evol. Biol*, 18, 744-749, 2005.

Bowker, M. A., Belnap, J., Davidson, D. W., and Goldstein, H.: Correlates of biological soil crust abundance across a continuum of spatial scales: support for a hierarchical conceptual model. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, 43, 152-163, 2006.

420 Callaway, R. M. Positive interactions among plants, *Bot. Rev.*, 61, 306-349, 1995.

Doherty, K. D., Antoninka, A. J., Bowker, M. A., Ayuso, S. V., and Johnson, N. C.: A novel approach to cultivate biocrusts for restoration and experimentation, *Ecol. Restor.*, 33(1), 13-16, 2015.

- 425 Ferrenberg, S., Reed, S. C., and Belnap, J.: Climate change and physical disturbance cause similar community shifts in biological soil crusts, *P. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 112(39),12116-12121, 2015.
- Garcia-Pichel, F., Belnap, J.: Microenvironments and microscale productivity of cyanobacterial desert crusts, *J. Phycol.*, 32, 774-782, 1996.
- Gilmore, A. M., Yamamoto, H. Y.: Resolution of lutein and zeaxanthin using a non-encapped, lightly
430 carbon-loaded C-18 high-performance liquid chromatographic column, *J. Chromatogr.*, 35, 137-145, 1991.
- Huxman, T. E., Snyder, K. A., Tissue, D., Leffler A. J., Ogle, K., Pockman, W. T., Sandquist, D. R., Potts, D. L., and Schwinning, S.: Precipitation pulses and carbon fluxes in semiarid and arid ecosystems, *Oecologia*,141, 254–268, doi: 10.1007/s00442-004-1682-4, 2004.
- IPCC.: Climate change: the physical science basis: Working group I contribution to the fourth assessment report
435 of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Jia, R. L., Li, X. R., Liu, L. C., Gao, Y. H., and Li, X. J.: Responses of biological soil crusts to sand burial in a revegetated area of the Tengger Desert, Northern China, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 40, 2827-2834, 2008.
- Jia, R. L., Li, X. R., Liu, L. C., Gao, Y. H., and Li, X.T.: Differential wind tolerance of soil crust mosses explains their micro-distribution in nature, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 2012, 45, 31-39, 2012.
- 440 Kent, M., Owen, N. W., and Dale, M. P.: Photosynthetic responses of plant communities to sand burial on the machair dune systems of the ~~outer~~Outer Hebrides, Scotland, *Ann. Bot.*, 95: 869–877, doi:10.1093/aob/mci093, 2005.
- Kidron, G. J., Vonshak, A., and Abeliovich, A.: Microbiotic crusts as biomarkers for surface stability and wetness duration in the Negev Desert, *Earth Surf. Proc. Land.*, 34(12) , 1594-1604, 2010.
- 445 Lan, S. B., Wu, L., Zhang, D. L., and Hu, C. X.: Desiccation provides photosynthetic protection for crust cyanobacteria *Microcoleus vaginatus* from high temperature, *Physiol. Plantarum*, doi:10.1111/ppl.12176, 2014.
- Li, J. H, Li, X. R., and Zhang, P.: Micro-morphology, ultrastructure and chemical composition changes of *Bryum argenteum* from a desert biological soil crust following one-year desiccation, *Bryologist*, 117,

450 232-240, 2014.

Li, X. R.: Eco-hydrology of biological soil crusts in desert region of China. Higher Education Press, 2012.

Li, X. R., He, M. Z., Zerbe, S., Li, X. J., and Liu, L. C.: Micro-geomorphology determines community structure of biological soil crusts at small scales, *Earth Surf. Proc. Land.*, 35, 932–940, 2010.

Li, X. R., Xiao, H. L., Zhang, J. G., and Wang, X. P.: Long-term ecosystem effects of sand-binding vegetation in the Tengger Desert, northern China, *Restor. Ecol.*, 12(3), 376-390, 2004.

Li, X. R., Zhang, P., Su, Y. G., and Jia, R. L.: Carbon fixation by biological soil crusts following revegetation of sand dunes in arid desert regions of China: A four-year field study, *Catena*, 97, 119-26, 2012.

Li, X. Y., Gong, J. D., Gao, Q. Z., and Wei, X. H.: Rainfall interception loss by pebble mulch in the semiarid region of China, *J. Hydrol.*, 228, 165–173, 2000.

460 Liu, B., Liu, Z. M., Lü, X. T., Maestre, F. T., and Wang, L. X.: Sand burial compensates for the negative effects of erosion on the dune-building shrub *Artemisia wudanica*, *Plant Soil*, doi: 10.1007/s11104-013-1866-y, 2013.

Maestre, F. T., Mart ín, N., D éz, B., L ópez-Poma, R., Santos, F., Luque, I., and Cortina, J.: Watering, fertilization, and slurry inoculation promote recovery of biological crust function in degraded soils, *Microb. Ecol.*, 52(3), 365-77, 2006.

465 Mart íez, M. L., Maun, M. A.: Responses of dune mosses to experimental burial by sand under natural and greenhouse conditions, *Plant Ecol.*, 145, 209-219, 1999

Maun, M. A.: Adaptations of plants to burial in coastal sand dune systems. *Can. J. Bot.*, 7, 713–738, 1998.

Maun, M. A.: Burial of plants as a selective force in sand dunes. In: Martinez, M. L., Psuty, N. P. [Eds.]: Coastal Dunes: Ecology and Management, Springer, 119–136, 2008.

470 Meng, J., Bu, C. F., Zhang, X. C., and Sun, Z. F.: Effects of biological crust removal and sand mulching on soil evaporation in a sandy soil, *Bul. Soil Water Conserv.*, 31, 58-62, 2011 (In Chinese with English abstract).

Powell, J. T., Chatziefthimiou, A. D., Banack, S. A., and Cox, P. A., and Metcalf, J. S.: Desert crust microorganisms, their environment, and human health, *J. Arid Environ*, 112, 127-133, 2015.

- 475 Rao, B. Q., Liu, Y. D., Lan, S. B., Wu, P. P., Wang, W. B., and Li, D. H.: Effects of sand burial stress on the early developments of cyanobacterial crusts in the field, *Eur. J. Soil Bio.*, 48(2), 48-55, 2012.
- Reed S. C., Coe, K. K., Sparks, J. P., Housman, D. C., Zelikova, T. J., and Belnap, J.: Changes to dryland rainfall result in rapid moss mortality and altered soil fertility, *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, 2(10), 752–755, 2012
- Stark, L. R., Nichols, L., McLetchie, D. N., Smith, S. D., and Zundel, C.: Age and sex specific rates of leaf
480 regeneration in the Mojave Desert moss *Syntrichia caninervis*, *Am. J. Bot.*, 91, 1-9, 2004.
- Smith, M. D.: An ecological perspective on extreme climatic events: a synthetic definition and framework to guide future research, *J. Ecol.*, 99(3), 656-663, 2011.
- Steinberg, C. E. W.: Stress ecology: environmental stress as ecological driving force and key player in evolution, doi: 10.1007/978-94-007-2072-5, Springer, 2012.
- 485 Turnbull, J. D., Leslie, S. J. and Robinson, S. A.: Desiccation protects Antarctic mosses from ultraviolet-B induced DNA damage. *Funct. Plant Biol.*, 36 (3), 214-221, 2009.
- Weber, B., Büdel, B., Belnap, J. (Eds.): Biological soil crusts: an organizing principle in drylands, *Ecological Studies* 226, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-30214-0, Springer, 2016.
- Whitford, W. G.: Ecology of desert systems, Academic Press, 2002.
- 490 Williams, W. J., Eldridge, D. J.: Deposition of sand over a cyanobacterial soil crust increases nitrogen bioavailability in a semi-arid woodland, *Appl. Soil Ecol.*, 49, 26-31, 2011.
- Xie, Z., Liu, Y., Hu, C., Chen, L., and Li, D.: Relationships between the biomass of algal crusts in fields and their compressive strength, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 39(2), 567-572, 2007.
- Xu, S. J., Liu, C. J., Jiang, P. A., Cai, W. M., and Wang, Y.: The effects of drying following heat shock exposure
495 of the desert moss *Syntrichia caninervis*, *Sci. Total Environ.*, 407, 2411-2419, 2009.
- Zhang, Y. M., Wu, N., Zhang, B. C., and Zhang, J.: Species composition, distribution patterns and ecological functions of biological soil crusts in the Gurbantunggut Desert, *J. Arid Land*, 2, 180-189, doi:10.3724/sp.j.1227.2010.00180, 2010.

500

505

510

515

Table 1. Changes in the percentage cover of *Bryum argenteum* Hedw. within a biocrust in response to sand burial depth in spring and autumn. ~~Changes in the percentage cover of a biocrust dominated by *Bryum argenteum* in response to sand burial depth in spring and autumn.~~

带格式的：字体：倾斜

Sand burial depth (mm)	Season	
	Spring	Autumn
0	100.000±0.000a	100.000±0.000a


0.5	53.556±0.882c	67.960±0.923b
1	22.667±2.915e	28.433±0.308d
2	0.000±0.000g	4.667±0.577f
4	0.000±0.000g	0.000±0.000g
10	0.000±0.000g	0.000±0.000g

Values are means (\pm SE), different letters indicate significant differences between different sand burial depth treatments at the $p < 0.05$ level as determined using a least significant difference (LSD) post-hoc test, $n = 9$.

525

530

535



540 Figure 1. Location and main landscapes of the Shapotou zone in the southeastern edge of the Tengger Desert.
As a pioneer species, *Bryum argenteum* Hedw. has colonized and flourishes on the soil surface of the
revegetation area (a) by controlling burial stress in the previously shifting sand dunes (c). This was initially
achieved through the combined application of wind barriers, straw checkerboards, and the planting of shrubs
without irrigation (b) 60 years ago.

545




Figure 2. Changes in the chlorophyll a content of the biocrust moss *Bryum argenteum* Hedw. following exposure

to combinations of single (receiving the natural precipitation amount, control), double (receiving 1/2 of the natural precipitation amount) and fourfold (receiving 1/4 of the natural precipitation amount) drought and 0 (control), 0.5, 1, 2, 4, and 10 mm ~~combination of three levels of drought severity and six~~ depths of sand burial

in spring (a, c) and autumn (b, d). Bars represent means (\pm SE). Different letters indicate significant differences between different drought severities and sand burial depth treatments at the $p < 0.05$ level, as determined using a

least significant difference (LSD) post-hoc test.





Figure 3. Changes in the PSII photochemical efficiency (Fv/Fm) of the biocrust moss *Bryum argenteum* Hedw.

following exposure to combinations of single (receiving the natural precipitation amount, control), double (receiving 1/2 of the natural precipitation amount) and fourfold (receiving 1/4 of the natural precipitation

amount) drought and 0 (control), 0.5, 1, 2, 4, and 10 mm ~~combination of three levels of drought severity and~~
~~six~~ depths of sand burial in spring (a, c) and autumn (b, d). Bars represent means (\pm SE). Different letters
indicate significant differences between different drought severities and sand burial depth treatments at the p
580 <0.05 level as determined using a least significant difference (LSD) post-hoc test in spring and autumn.

585

590



595

600

605




Figure 4. Changes in the protonemal area of detached shoots of biocrust moss *Bryum argenteum* Hedw.

610 following exposure to combinations of single (receiving the natural precipitation amount, control), double (receiving 1/2 of the natural precipitation amount) and fourfold (receiving 1/4 of the natural precipitation amount) drought and 0 (control), 0.5, 1, 2, 4, and 10 mm combination of three levels of drought severity and six depths of sand burial in spring (a, e) and autumn (b, d). Bars represent means (\pm SE). Different letters indicate significant differences between different drought severities and sand burial depth treatments at the p

615 <0.05 level as determined using a least significant difference (LSD) post-hoc test.

620

625




Figure 5. Changes in the maximal shoot elongation of biocrust moss *Bryum argenteum* Hedw. following exposure to [combinations of single \(receiving the natural precipitation amount, control\), double \(receiving 1/2](#)

630

of the natural precipitation amount) and fourfold (receiving 1/4 of the natural precipitation amount) drought and
0 (control), 0.5, 1, 2, 4, and 10 mm depths of a combination of three severity drought and six depth sand burial
in spring (a, c) and autumn (b, d). Bars represent means (\pm SE). Different letters indicate significant differences
between different drought severities and sand burial depth treatments at the $p < 0.05$ level as determined using a
least significant difference (LSD) post-hoc test.

635

640

645

650

655




Figure 6. Redundancy analysis (RDA) diagram of the effect of drought, sand burial, and their combination on the chlorophyll a content, PSII photochemical efficiency (Fv/Fm), regeneration potential (protonemal area), and shoot upgrowth (maximal shoot elongation) of biocrust moss *Bryum argenteum* Hedw.

Under a shallow sand burial treatment, the eigenvalues were 0.8134 and 0.0152 for the first and second axes, respectively, and the correlation coefficients were 0.9527 and 0.4876, respectively. In terms of deep sand burial, the eigenvalues of the first and second axes were 0.6068 and 0.2379, respectively, and the correlation coefficients were 0.9362 and 0.9126, respectively. The Monte Carlo permutation test indicates that all variables were significantly correlated with the environmental factors ($p < 0.05$).