

# An Ecological Analysis of Himalayan Forest Ecosystems

V. P. Upadhyay

**ABSTRACT** The paper deals with certain phytosociological parameters and litter decomposition in five forest ecosystems, viz. sal forest, pine-mixed broadleaf forest, pine forest, mixed oak-pine forest and mixed oak forest located between 300 m and 2150 m altitude. The dominant tree species in the above zones are *Shorea robusta*, *Pinus roxburghii*, *Quercus leucotrichophora*, *Quercus floribunda* and *Quercus lanuginosa*. The rate of decomposition of leaf litter was found higher at sal forest site followed by pine mixed broadleaf, oak, oak-pine and pine forest sites. The release of N, P, K, Ca and Na was found higher at sal forest site compared to the other sites during decomposition.

## INTRODUCTION

Investigation on phytosociology and decomposition is an important aspect of ecosystem structure and function. A major part of annual gain of energy and matter by plants is returned to the forest floor as litter which enters into the decomposition subsystems as dead organic matter or detritus. Decomposition of litter is regulated by a host of variables including the litter's physical and chemical properties, habitat, and macro and micro faunal responses. In spite of the complexity of the decay process, the two most important control of litter decomposition rates are probably the prevailing climatic conditions and the susceptibility of the substrate to attack by specialized decomposers, i.e. substrate quality (Meentemeyer, 1978). Decomposition in terrestrial ecosystem is commonly studied using the litter bag method, which consists of enclosing the plant material of known mass and chemical composition in a screened container. Initially, a large number of bags are placed in the field and at each sampling date randomly chosen set of bags is retrieved and analysed for loss of mass and changes in chemical composition. The litter bag method may underestimate the actual decomposition (Wieder and Lang, 1982), it is still assumed, however, that the results of litter bag studies will reflect trends characteristic of unconfined litter and as such allow for comparisons among species, sites and experimental manipulations.

## STUDY SITE

Five forest ecosystems were selected for vegetation analysis and decomposition study. The sites ranged in altitude from 329-2150 m and were located between 29° 7' to 29° 26' N lat and 79° 15' to 79° 38' E long.

The forest sites were Chorgalia (sal forest), Kalona (pine-mixed broadleaf forest), Baldiyakhan (pine forest), Ranikhet (mixed oak-pine forest) and Kilbury (mixed oak forest). The sal forest site occupied the lowest position in the altitudinal gradient and the mixed oak forest site the highest. The climate of sal forest site was monsoon subtropical and of others monsoon temperate.

The leaf litter species and the sites were as follows:

Litter species	Forest site/Altitude
<i>S. robusta</i>	Sal forest, 329 m
<i>M. philippensis</i>	
<i>L. ovalifolia</i>	
<i>Q. glauca</i>	Pine-mixed broadleaf forest, 1250 m
<i>R. arboreum</i>	
<i>P. roxburghii</i>	Pine forest, 1500 m
<i>M. esculenta</i>	Mixed oak-pine forest, 1750 m.
<i>Q. lanuginosa</i>	
<i>Q. floribunda</i>	Mixed oak forest, 2150 m

In addition to the above, leaf litter of *Q. leucotrichophora* was selected for placement on the forest floors of each site as standard material.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### VEGETATIONAL ANALYSIS

Tree layer analysis was carried out by taking 10×10 m quadrat. A total of 10 quadrats were studied for phytosociological observation. At the sal forest site *S. robusta* had greatest density (194 trees/ha) and at the pine mixed broadleaf forest sites *P. roxburghii* had the greatest density (163 trees/ha) among the tree layer species. At the pine, the mixed oak pine and the mixed oak forest sites, *P. roxburghii*, *Q. leucotrichophora* and *Q. lanuginosa* had, respectively, greatest den-

Environment: Change and Management  
R.C. Mohanty, Editor

Table 1: Composition of tree and sapling layer of experimental forest sites

Species	Tree layer Density (ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Total basal cover (m <sup>2</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Importance value Index (IVI)	Sapling Density (ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Total basal cover (m <sup>2</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Importance value (IVI)
<b>Sal Forest</b>						
<i>Shorea robusta</i> Gartn.	194	51.21	174	0	-	-
<i>Mallotus philippensis</i> Muell. Arg.	106	3.36	61	44	0.12	216
<i>Cassia fistula</i> Linn.	56	0.79	36	13	0.07	84
<i>Lagerstroemia parviflora</i> Roxb.	31	1.10	24	-	-	-
<i>Litsea polyantha</i> Juss.	6	0.37	5	-	-	-
<b>Pine-mixed broad-leaf forest</b>						
<i>Pinus roxburghii</i> Sarg.	63	12.74	85	2	0.01	8
<i>Quercus leucotrichopora</i> A. Camus.	30	3.52	36	0	-	-
<i>Syzgium cumini</i> Lamk.	31	0.98	25	3	0.02	19
<i>Machilus duthiei</i> King.	27	1.23	22	5	0.03	23
<i>Myrica esculenta</i> Thunb.	19	0.79	17	3	0.01	15
<i>Lyonia ovalifolia</i> (Wall) Drude.	27	0.53	17	8	0.04	41
<i>Quercus glauca</i> Thunb.	17	1.35	15	-	-	-
<i>Symplocos ramosissima</i> Wall.	19	0.35	14	16	0.06	74
<i>Rhododendron arboreum</i> Smith.	17	0.63	12	-	-	-
<i>Pyrus pashia</i> Buch-Ham ex D. Don	8	0.49	9	-	-	-
<i>Carpinus viminea</i> Lindl.	11	0.32	9	-	-	-
<i>Symplocos crataegoides</i> Buch-Ham.	10	0.19	8	5	0.03	29
<i>Engelhardtia colebrookia</i> Lindl.	6	0.15	5	-	-	-
<i>Myrsine semi-serrata</i> Wall.	6	0.11	4	8	0.05	39
<i>Ilex diphyrena</i> Wall.	5	0.12	4	-	-	-
Unidentified	3	0.12	4	-	-	-
<i>Eugenia frondosa</i> Wall.	3	0.28	3	-	-	-
<i>Symplocos crataegoides</i>	5	0.14	3	2	0.01	10
<i>Euonymus tingens</i> Wall.	5	0.09	3	2	0.01	9
<i>Acer oblongum</i> Wall. ex DC.	2	0.07	2	-	-	-
<i>Eurya acuminata</i>						

DC.	2	0.03		3	0.01	10
<i>Acer laevigatum</i> Wall.	2	0.02		2	0.01	10
<i>Randia tetrasperma</i> Benth & Hook	-	-		2	0.003	7
<b>Pine forest</b>						
<i>P. roxburghii</i>	575	33.32		247	50	0.30 169
<i>M. esculenta</i>	58	2.12		31	17	0.11 75
<i>L. ovalifolia</i>	8	0.11		7	-	-
<i>R. arboreum</i>	8	0.08		7	-	-
<i>S. ramosissima</i>	8	0.29		8	-	-
<i>P. pashia</i>	-	-		-	17	0.10 56
<b>Mixed oak-pine forest</b>						
<i>Q. leucotrichopora</i>	433	19.06		135	75	0.21 97
<i>P. roxburghii</i>	67	12.14		55	42	0.05 49
<i>M. esculenta</i>	175	4.27		54	50	0.17 80
<b>Cedrus deodara</b>						
Loud.	33	2.96		22	-	-
<i>R. arboreum</i>	25	0.46		10	-	-
<b>Symplocos crataegoides</b>						
	8	0.08		4	-	-
<i>M. duthiei</i>	17	0.19		8	-	-
<b>Cupressus torulosa</b>						
Don.	17	1.01		7	8	-
<b>Acacia nilotica</b>						
(Linn) Del.	8	0.31		5	42	0.09 51
<i>Ilex diphyrena</i> Wall.	-	-		-	8	0.01 11
<b>Mixed oak forest</b>						
<b>Quercus lanuginosa</b>						
Don.	629	42.21		179	221	0.77 234
<b>Quercus floribunda</b>						
Lindl.	257	13.37		80	50	0.10 49
<i>R. arboreum</i>	86	3.48		31	-	-
<i>Q. leucotrichopora</i>	21	0.62		10	-	-
<i>P. pashia</i>	-	-		-	7	0.04 17

sity, i.e., 575, 433 and 629 trees/ha compared to other tree layer components (Table 1).

The values of frequency, density and abundance of individual species of herb layer were recorded for all forest sites. The herb layer was studied by taking 1×1 m quadrat. The herbs were sampled in the rainy season where they are normally most abundant.

#### WEIGHT LOSS

The litter bag technique was followed for decomposition experiments. A total of 120 litter bags each having five grams air dried leaf litter for each species were placed on the forest floor of respective forest sites. A random collection of 5 litter bags in each month for each species was made to find out the weight loss and nutrient release.

In the present study the species placed at the sal forest site decomposed at a faster rate and the

Table 2: Analysis of herbaceous vegetation on different forest sites

Species	Frequency (%)	Density (ind. m <sup>-2</sup> )	Abundance (ind. m <sup>-2</sup> )
<b>Sal forest</b>			
<i>Desmostachya bipinnata</i>	25	2.90	11.50
<i>Clerodendron infortunatum</i> Linn. (shrub) seedlings	100	5.93	5.93
<b>Pine-mixed broad-leaf forest</b>			
<i>Chrysopogon serrulatus</i> Trin	20	22.30	111.50
<i>Carex condensata</i> Nees ex Wiegert	10	11.00	110.00
<i>Muhlenbergia himalensis</i> Hack ex HK.F.	10	10.50	105.00
<i>Cappilidium assimile</i>	10	7.20	72.00
<i>Apluda mutica</i> Linn.	20	4.90	24.50
<i>Cyperus iria</i> Linn.	10	4.20	42.00
<i>Oplismenus compositus</i> (Linn.) P. Beauv.	30	3.80	12.66
<i>Pouzolzia hirta</i> Hasask.	30	2.00	6.66
<i>Erigeron bonariensis</i> Linn.	10	0.80	8.00
<i>Lastrea dividia</i>	10	0.60	6.00
<i>Nicus argericanthus</i>	10	0.20	2.00
<i>Remusatia hookeriana</i> Schott.	10	0.20	2.00
<b>Pine forest</b>			
<i>Arundiella nepalensis</i> Trin.	30	19.80	66.00
<i>Selaqinella selaginoides</i>	10	9.80	98.00
<i>Imperata cylindrica</i> (L.) P. Beauv.	20	7.80	39.00
<i>Achyranthes aspara</i> (Linn.) Hook.	60	7.40	12.33
<i>Cyperus iria</i> Linn.	30	5.20	17.33
<i>Setaria glauca</i> (Linn.) P. Beauv.	10	4.90	12.25
<i>Ophiopogon intermedia</i> D. Don.	20	2.40	12.00
<i>Carex nubigena</i> D. Don.	10	3.00	30.00
<i>Puzolzia hirta</i>	40	1.80	4.50
<i>Muhlenbergia himalayensis</i> Hack ex Hook.	10	1.80	18.00
<i>Anaphalis busua</i> (Such.-Ham.) Hand.-Maz.	30	1.50	5.00
<i>Desmodium tiliaefolium</i> Baker.	40	1.00	2.50
<i>Oplismenus Compositus</i> (Linn.) P. Beauv.	10	0.80	8.00
<i>Ranunculus aryensis</i> Linn.	40	0.80	2.00
<i>Remusatia hookeriana</i>	30	0.70	2.33
<i>Flemingia fruticulosa</i> Wall. ex Benth	10	0.20	2.00
<b>Mixed oak-pine forest</b>			
<i>Commelina paludosa</i> Bl. Var. <i>mathewii</i> Rola Rao et Kamathy	100	13.25	13.25
<i>Roscoeia alpina</i> Royle	100	11.25	11.25
<i>Ainsliaea aptera</i> DC.	91.67	6.83	7.45
<i>Cymbopogon distans</i> (Nees) Wats.	75.00	5.17	6.89
<i>Desmodium tiliaefolium</i>	33.33	4.58	13.75

<i>Strobilanthes dalhausianus</i> (Nees) Clarke	83.33	3.58	4.30
<i>Flemingia fruticulosa</i>	75.00	2.42	3.22
<i>Rubia cordifolia</i> Hook. f.	16.67	2.17	13.00
<i>Hedera nepalensis</i> K. Koch.	33.33	0.92	2.75
<i>Habenaria marginata</i>	8.33	0.33	4.00
<i>Murdannia divergens</i> (Cl.) Buckn.	8.33	0.25	3.00
<i>Ophiopogon intermedia</i>	8.33	0.17	2.00
<i>Vitis himalayana</i> Brandis	8.33	0.08	1.00
<b>Mixed oak forest</b>			
<i>Carex nubigena</i>	85.70	77.28	90.17
<i>Carex condensata</i>	78.56	48.71	62.00
<i>Themeda anthera</i> (Nees.) ex Roxb.	14.29	0.50	3.50
<i>Viola canescens</i> Wall.	14.29	0.71	5.00
<i>Cyperus iria</i> Linn.	35.71	1.64	4.60
<i>Smilax parviflora</i> Wall. ex Kunth.	49.99	5.36	10.71
<i>Galium aparine</i> Linn.	14.29	0.84	6.00
<i>Anaphalis busua</i>	28.57	1.79	6.25
<i>Commelina paludosa</i>	14.29	0.57	4.00
<i>Scutellaria angulosa</i> Benth	7.14	0.07	1.00
<i>Artemisia vulgaris</i> Linn.	7.19	1.93	0.07
<i>Roscoeia alpina</i>	21.43	0.43	2.00
<i>Arundinaria fulcata</i> Nees	21.43	2.28	10.67
<i>Polygala crotolaroides</i> Buch.-Ham. ex DC.	14.29	1.50	10.50
<i>Valeriana Walllichii</i> DC.	71.43	10.14	14.20
<i>Arundinella nepalensis</i>	28.57	3.50	12.25
<i>Carex filicina</i> nees ex Wight	57.14	3.36	5.88
<i>Erigeron bonariensis</i> Linn.	57.14	7.00	12.25
<i>Strobilanthes dalhausianus</i>	28.57	0.93	3.25
<i>Rubia cordifolia</i> Hoo. f.	14.29	0.93	6.50
<i>Stachys aspara</i>	21.43	0.50	2.33

species placed at the pine forest site decomposed most slowly. At the sal forest site, *S. robusta* and *Q. leucotrichophora* decomposed completely in 396 days and *M. philippensis* in 365 days. On the pine mixed broadleaf site, *L. ovalifolia* and *Q. glauca* decomposed in 396 days and 365 days, respectively. But, *R. arboreum* and *Q. leucotrichophora* decomposed respectively in 608 and 520 days. At the pine forest site, in *P. roxburghii* 92% decomposition was achieved in 730 days whereas *Q. leucotrichophora* decomposed completely in 609 days. At the mixed oak-pine forest site decomposition was complete in 609 and 639 days, respectively for *Q. leucotrichophora* and *M. esculenta*. At the mixed oak forest site, *Q. leucotrichophora* decomposed completely in 548 days while *Q. lanuginosa* and *Q. floribunda* decomposed completely in 669 days. Differences in the rate of decomposition among species of different forest sites have been reported by several authors including Wiegert and McGinn-

is (1975) and Gupta and Singh (1977, 1981) and Pandey and Singh (1982)

Edwards (1977) while studying the decomposition of leaf litter species found that the species placed at Ridge site decomposed slowly than on the valley site.

A comparison of rates of leaf litter decomposition for a variety of habitats shows that the present rates lie within the general range of values reported for temperate species (Table 3).

#### *Immobilization and Release of Nutrients*

The decomposition of litter is the primary mechanism by which nutrients are returned to the

forest soils and the organic matter is incorporated in them. The release of nutrients from litter is a basic process in nutrient cycling within the ecosystem. The dynamics of nutrients are complicated since the nutrients appear in different forms and are subject to many types of transformations such as leaching, immobilization and mineralisation. Increases in concentration of N, P and Na were observed in all species in the annual cycle whereas only *P. roxburghii* and *M. esculenta* showed increase in calcium content for initial periods. There was no increase in K. concentration in any species.

Fastest rates of release of nutrients were ob-

**Table 3: Rate of decomposition of leaf-litter in certain forest types of the world**

Vegetation	Place	Rate (% day <sup>-1</sup> )	Reference
Oak forests	California, U. S. A.	0.016-0.32	Jenny <i>et al.</i> (1949)
Oak forests	Minnesota, U. S. A.	0.018	Reiners and Reiners (1970)
Oak forests (Leaf litter)	Missouri, U. S. A.	0.095	Rochw (1974)
Mixed oak forests	New Jersey, U. S. A.	0.178	Lang (1974)
<i>Quercus patraea</i>	Roudsea wood, England	0.12-0.14	Boscock and Gilbert (1257)
<i>Quercus alba</i>	Eastern United States	0.107	Shanks and Olson (1961)
<i>Quercus alba</i>	Eastern United States	0.126	Witkamp and Olson (1963)
<i>Quercus alba</i>	Tennessee, U. S. A.	0.150	Witkamp (1966)
Oak leaves <sup>1</sup>	Rothamsted, England	0.300	Edwards and Heath (1963)
<i>Quercus robur</i>	Rothamsted, England	0.240	Heath <i>et al.</i> (1966)
<i>Quercus robur</i>	U. S. S. R.	0.090-0.096	Zlotin (1970)
Pine forests	California, U. S. A.	0.0027-0.0082	Jenny <i>et al.</i> (1949)
Short pine forests	South-east Missouri, U. S. A.	0.036	Crosby (1961)
Pome forests	South Eastern U. S. A.	0.070	Olson (1963)
Pine forests	Minnesota, U. S. A.	0.017	Olson (1963)
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	England	0.033	Kendrick (1959)
<i>Pinus alba</i>	Tennessee, U. S. A.	0.110	Witkamp (1966)
<i>Pinus taeda</i>	Tennessee, U. S. A.	0.120	Thomas (1968)
Pine needies	England	0.083	Karenlampi (1971)
<i>Aesculus indica</i>	Naini Tal, India	0.290	Pandey (1979)
<i>Daphane cannabina</i>	Naini Tal, India	0.365	Pandey (1979)
<i>Ilex dipyreha</i>	Naini Tal, India	0.0.329	Pandey (1979)
<i>Quercus floribunda</i>	Naini Tal, India	0.193	Pandey (1979)
<i>Quercus leucotrichophora</i>	Naini Tal, India	0.193	Pandey (1979)
<i>Cedrus deodara</i>	Naini Tal, India	0.158	Pandey (1979)
<i>Cupressus torulosa</i>	Naini Tal, India	0.139	Pandey (1979)
<i>Shorea robusta</i>	Chorgalia, Naini Tal, India	0.253	Present Study
<i>Mallotus philippensis</i>	Chorgalia, Naini Tal, India	0.274	Present Study
<i>Quercus leucotrichophora</i>	Chorgalia, Naini Tal, India	0.253	Present Study
<i>Lyonia ovalifolia</i>	Kalona, Naini Tal, India	0.253	Present Study
<i>Quercus glauca</i>	Kalona, Naini Tal, India	0.274	Present Study
<i>Rhododendron arboreum</i>	Kalona, Naini Tal, India	0.165	Present Study
<i>Quercus leucotrichophora</i>	Kalona, Naini Tal, India	0.192	Present Study
<i>Pinus roxburghii</i>	Balidiyakhn, Naini Tal, India	0.126	Present Study
<i>Quercus leucotrichophora</i>	Balidiyakhn, Naini Tal, India	0.165	Present Study
<i>Quercus leucotrichophora</i>	Ranikhet, Almora, India	0.165	Present Study
<i>Myrica esculenta</i>	Ranikhet, Almora, India	0.156	Present Study
<i>Quercus Lanuginosa</i>	Kilbury, Naini Tal, India	0.150	Present Study
<i>Quercus floribunda</i>	Kilbury, Naini Tal, India	0.150	Present Study
<i>Quercus leucotrichophora</i>	Kilbury, Naini Tal, India	0.183	Present Study

Table 4: Time (years), required for 99% release of nutrients for species of different forest sites

Site	Species	Organic matter	N	P	Na	K	Ca
Sal	<i>S. robusta</i>	1.09	1.83	1.58	2.10	1.22	1.25
	<i>M. Philippensis</i>	1.00	1.85	1.50	1.26	1.00	1.04
	<i>Q. leucotrichophora</i>	1.09	1.18	1.18	1.31	1.48	1.57
	<i>L. ovalifolia</i>	1.09	1.82	2.09	1.82	1.19	1.30
Pine mixed broadleaf	<i>Q. glauca</i>	1.00	2.73	2.65	2.97	1.46	1.47
	<i>R. arborzum</i>	1.66	3.44	3.72	3.32	1.87	2.25
Pine	<i>Q. leucotrichophora</i>	1.43	2.18	2.05	2.18	1.48	1.57
	<i>P. roxburghii</i>	3.57	5.18	5.91	5.91	2.99	4.80
Mixed oak-pine	<i>Q. leucotrichophora</i>	1.83	4.12	4.52	3.97	2.40	2.62
	<i>M. esculenta</i>	1.67	2.59	1.87	2.99	1.91	2.00
Mixed oak	<i>Q. Lanuginosa</i>	1.75	4.39	2.06	5.91	2.04	2.67
	<i>Q. floribunda</i>	1.83	3.84	3.03	3.32	2.29	2.39
	<i>Q. leucotrichophora</i>	1.83	4.27	3.32	3.72	1.74	2.28
		1.50	1.91	1.57	1.75	1.20	1.39

served at the sal and pine-mixed broadleaf forest sites and slowest at the pine forest sites. The N release was faster in *Q. leucotrichophora* (sal forest), *L. ovalifolia*, *S. robusta* and *M. Philippensis* and slowest in *P. roxburghii*. In some cases, the P release was faster than N. P release was fastest at the sal forest site and slowest at the pine forest site. There was no immobilisation of K in the decomposing material and K release was faster than the

Ca release. Release of both the nutrients was faster at the sal and the pine-mixed broadleaf forest sites and slowest at the pine forest site. Faster release of K compared to other nutrients was also observed by Boccock *et al.* (1961); Gosz *et al.* (1973) and Vogt *et al.* (1983).

Turnover is assumed to follow a negative exponential function  $X_t/X_0 = e^{-kt}$ , where  $X_0$  = initial mass,  $X_t$  = mass at time  $t$ ,  $k$  is a constant and  $t$  = time (Olson, 1963). Time required for the disappearance of 99% of the initial amount of the litter comes to:

$$t(99\%) = 4.605/(-k)$$

The time for 99% release of litter dry matter and nutrients for the present species is given in table 4. The faster rate of weight loss and nutrient release in general was observed for the species of sal forest site and the pine mixed broadleaf forest site and slower release for the species placed at pine forest site.

#### Nutrient Release in Forest Floor

Table 5 includes the litter and nutrient inputs and the nutrient release for few species at different forest sites. The leaf litter input values were adopted from Mehra (1984). The total release of nitrogen, phosphorus, sodium, potassium and calcium for the species shown in table 5 was estimated by multiplying the input values with fractional nutrient losses for the bags. Faster dry weight loss as well as nutrient release were observed at the sal forest site followed by pine-mixed broadleaf,

Table 5: Input and release of organic matter, and selected nutrients in the forest soil through selected species.

Forest	Species	Organic matter		Chemical Components (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )									
		(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )		N		P		Na		K		Ca	
		A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Sal	<i>S. robusta</i>	4505	4152	44.60	41.03	12.61	11.93	1.80	1.60	21.17	20.66	73.43	71.59
	<i>M. Philippensis</i>	316	316	1.64	1.64	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.79	0.79	6.73	6.75
Pine mixed broadleaf	<i>Q. glauca</i>	894	894	8.40	7.56	0.63	0.58	0.72	0.52	7.15	7.15	10.10	10.10
Pine	<i>P. roxburghii</i>	5820	2690	38.99	16.18	2.91	1.30	0.64	0.29	7.57	3.61	29.68	12.61
Mixed oak-pine	<i>Q. leucotrichophora</i>	3616	2166	41.56	24.67	7.95	4.92	2.53	1.50	24.94	15.40	39.75	29.45
Mixed oak	<i>Q. lanuginosa</i>	3641	1987	48.06	25.80	4.37	2.51	2.91	1.23	26.94	16.32	45.15	27.17
	<i>Q. Floribunda</i>	3954	2157	38.35	19.86	4.75	2.67	3.16	1.72	28.47	17.71	52.19	31.61

A = Input, B = release

mixed oak pine, mixed oak and the pine, mixed oak and the pine forest sites. At the sal forest site, *M. Philippensis* decomposed completely at the end of annual cycle and 100% release of nutrient occurred within one year. All the species at the mixed oak and mixed oak-pine forest sites released nutrients at the rate of 50% per year. Potassium release was faster at all sites compared to other nutrients.

## REFERENCES

- Bocock, K.L. and Gilbert, O.J.: The disappearance of litter under different woodland conditions. *Plant and Soil*, 9: 179-185 (1957).
- Bocock K. L., Gilbert, O., Capstick, C. K., Twinn, D. C., Waid, J. S. Woodman, M. J. : Changes in leaf litter when placed on the surface of soils with contrasting humus types. I. Losses in dry weight of oak and ash leaf litter. *J. Soil Sci.*, 11: 1-9 (1961).
- Crosby, J.S.: Litter and duff fuel in shortleaf pine stands in southeast Missouri. Central States for *Exp. st. Tech. Paper* 178. U.S. Forestry Service Columbus, Ohio, pp. 10 (1961).
- Edwards, P. J.: Studies of mineral cycling in a Montane rain forest in New Guinea. II. The production and disappearance of litter. *J. Ecol.*, 65: 971-992 (1977).
- Edwards, C.A. and Health, G.W.: The role of soil animals in breakdown of leaf material. In: *Soil Organisms*, J. Docksens and J. Van der Drift (Eds.) pp. 76-84. North Holland, Amsterdam (1963).
- Gosz, J. R., Likens, G. E. and Bormann, F. H.: Nutrient release from decomposing leaf and branch litter in the Hubbard brook forest, New Hampshire. *Ecol. Monogr.*, 43: 173-191 (1973).
- Gupta, S. R. and Singh, J. S.: Decomposition of litter in a tropical grassland. *Pedobiologia*, 17: 234-237 (1977).
- Gupta, S. R. and Singh, J. S.: The effect of plant species, weather variables and chemical composition of plant material on decomposition in a tropical grassland. *Plant and Soil*, 59: 99-117 (1981).
- Health, G.W., Arnold, M.K. and Edwards, C.A.: Studies in leaf litter breakdown. I- Breakdown rates of leaves of different species. *Pedobiologia*, 6: 1-12 (1966).
- Jenny, H., Gessel, S.P. and Bingham: Comparative study of decomposition rates of organic matter in temperature and tropical regions. *Soil Sci.*, 68: 419-432 (1949).
- Karenlampi, L.: Weight loss of leaf litter on forest soil surface in relation to weather at Kevo station, Finnish lapland. *Rep. Kevo sub arctic Research Stat.*, 6: 101-103 (1971).
- Kendrick W.B.: The time factor in decomposition of coniferous leaf litter. *Can. J. Bot.*, 37: 907-912 (1959).
- Lang, G.E.: Litter dynamics in a mixed oak forest on the New Jersey Piedmont. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club*, 101: 277-286 (1974).
- Meentemeyer, V.: Macroclimate and lignin control of litter decomposition rates. *Ecology*, 59: 465-472 (1978).
- Mehra, M. S.: *Litter Fall and Nutrient Return in Certain Forest Ecosystems of Kumaun Himalaya*. Ph. D. Thesis, Kumaun University, Naini Tal, India. (1984).
- Olson, J. S.: Energy storage and the balance of producers and decomposers in ecological systems. *Ecology*, 44: 322-331 (1963).
- Pandey, U.: *Leaf fall, leaf litter decomposition and nutrient release in a mixed oak forest*. Ph.D. Thesis, Kumaun University, Naini Tal, India (1979).
- Pandey, U. and Singh, J. S.: Leaf litter decomposition in an oak-conifer forest in Himalaya: the effects of climate and chemical composition. *Forestry*, 55: 47-59 (1982).
- Reiners, W.A. and Reiners, N.M.: Energy and nutrient dynamics of forest floors in three Minnesota forest. *J. Ecol.*, 58: 497-519 (1970).
- Rochow, J.J.: Litter fall relations in a Missouri forest. *Oikos*, 25: 80-85 (1974).
- Shanks, R.E. and Olson, J.S.: First year breakdown of leaf litter in Southern Appalachian forests. *Science*, 134: 194-195 (1961).
- Thomas, W.A.: decomposition of loblolly pine needles with end without the addition of Dogwood leaves. *Ecology*, 49: 568-571 (1968).
- Vogt, K. A., Grier, C. C., Meier, C. E. and Keyes, M. R.: Organic matter and nutrient dynamics in forest floors of young and mature *Abies amabilis* stands in western Washington, as affected by fine-root input. *Ecol. Monogr.*, 53: 139-157 (1983).
- Wieder, R. K. and Lang, G. E.: A critique of the analytical methods used in examining decomposition data obtained from litter bags. *Ecology*, 63: 1636-1642 (1982).
- Wiegert, R. G. and McGinnis, J. T.: Annual production and disappearance of detritus on three south carolina old fields. *Ecology*, 56: 129-140 (1975).
- Witkamp, M. and Olson, J.S.: Breakdown of confined and non confined oak litter. *Oikos*, 4: 138-147 (1963).
- Zlotin, R.I.: Invertebrate animals as a factor of the biological turnover. IV *Colloq. Intern. de la fauna du sol*. Dijon 19 H: 455-462. Paris Institut nationale de la recherche agronomique Paris (1970).

Author's Address: V.P. Upadhyay, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Eastern Regional Office, 194, Kharvel Nagar, Bhubaneswar 751 001, Orissa, India

# **ENVIRONMENT: CHANGE AND MANAGEMENT**

**R. C. MOHANTY**  
Department of Botany  
Utkal University  
Bhubaneswar, Orissa, India

*with a Foreword by*  
**U. Schiewer**



**KAMLA-RAJ ENTERPRISES**

2273, Gali Bari Paharwali, Chawri Bazar, Delhi 110 006, India  
*(Publishers since 1933)*