BioRisk

BioRisk 23: 93–109 (2025)
DOI: 10.3897/biorisk.23.173254

Research Article

# Mechanical properties of thin roots of tree species for shallow landslide protection along an altitudinal gradient

Laura Sanchez-Castillo[1], Edmar Melendez-Jaramillo[1], Santos Daniel Chicas[2], Ma. Teresa de Jesus Segura Martinez[1], Marisol Gonzalez-Delgado[3]

1 *Faculty of Engineering and Sciences, Autonomous University of Tamaulipas, Centro Universitario, CP 87120 Ciudad Victoria, Tamaulipas, Mexico*
2 *Department of Agro-Environmental Science, Faculty of Agriculture, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*
3 *Centro de Producción Agropecuaria, Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, Carretera Nacional km. 143, Linares, Nuevo León, CP. 67700, Mexico*
*Corresponding author: Laura Sanchez-Castillo (laura.sanchez@uat.edu.mx)*

## Abstract

Shallow landslides and erosional problems in mountain areas are a recurrent issue that can represent a threat to human life and impact landscape ecology in many ways. Soil bioengineering is an approach that uses biological and ecological knowledge and engineering design principles to restore shallow-landslide-affected slopes. Tree species can be used as elements of soil bioengineering to reduce erosion and provide reinforcement through their roots. For this reason, we estimated the mechanical properties of thin tree roots from three vegetation communities along an elevational gradient. Our results showed that *Piper amalago* and *Pinus teocote* consistently exhibited higher mechanical properties than all species analyzed. The absence of a consistent altitudinal trend suggests that local site conditions and species-specific traits have a stronger influence on root mechanics than elevation alone.

**Key words:** Elasticity, forest, root reinforcement, tensile strength, thorn scrub

OPEN ACCESS

Academic editor: Pavel Stoev
Received: 26 September 2025
Accepted: 23 November 2025
Published: 11 December 2025

Citation: Sanchez-Castillo L, Melendez-Jaramillo E, Daniel Chicas S, Segura Martinez MaTdeJ, Gonzalez-Delgado M (2025) Mechanical properties of thin roots of tree species for shallow landslide protection along an altitudinal gradient. BioRisk 23: 93–109. https://doi.org/10.3897/biorisk.23.173254

Copyright: © Laura Sanchez-Castillo et al. This is an open access article distributed under terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (Attribution 4.0 International – CC BY 4.0).

## Introduction

Mountain environments are ecologically unique and play an important role in maintaining species biodiversity; however, they are also very susceptible when hydro-meteorological events occur. Rainfall-induced shallow landslides are a very important and dangerous hazard in mountainous areas. Shallow landslides are defined as the movement of soil along a slope with a sliding surface up to 2 m (Schaller et al. 2025). The investigation of the mechanical contribution of plant roots to soil has significant implications. From an environmental point of view, plant-based soil stabilization represents a solution for erosion control and ecosystem resilience, contributing to the restoration of degraded landscapes while maintaining soil health and plant species biodiversity. From a societal standpoint, the use of plants to reduce shallow landslides protects human lives and infrastructure, reducing economic losses in vulnerable rural mountainous regions.

Soil bioengineering is a nature-based solution that can be an alternative or complement to the conventional hydraulic or civil engineering approaches of

soil stabilization (Kettenhuber et al. 2022). Using biological and ecological knowledge and engineering design principles, this discipline allows plants to be used as living structures or in combination with plant community propagation to naturally control soil erosion, sediment flows, and flooding (Stokes et al. 2009; Bischetti et al. 2012; Jiang et al. 2024; Suresh et al. 2024). The development of natural vegetation on this structural intervention is of fundamental importance for soil erosion protection (Romano et al. 2022), especially on mountain slopes.

Tree species can help prevent soil erosion and shallow landslides in two ways: modifying the soil moisture regime via evapotranspiration and providing root reinforcement to soil (Stokes et al. 2009; Cao et al. 2025; Zhu et al. 2025). Soil root reinforcement is a very significant contribution by tree species to soil stability. If soils are shallow, roots can reach deeper to more stable substrates, and dense lateral root systems in upper soil horizons can form a mesh that stabilizes the soil. According to Wu et al. 1988, the root systems of trees can provide reinforcement in potential slope failures (Flepp et al. 2021; Huang et al. 2025; Kong et al. 2025). In mountainous areas, tree basal areas, organic matter, and dense root systems are of interest to prevent surface erosion problems (Schmidt et al. 2001; Hao et al. 2021; Gobinath et al. 2022; Liu et al. 2022).

The effect of roots on soil fixation has been studied and reported by many authors in many countries over the years (Genet et al. 2006; Abdi et al. 2018; Valizade and Tabarsa 2020; Masi et al. 2021; Meijer 2021; Su et al. 2021; Zhu et al. 2022). Models of root mechanical contribution to soil were created, usually overestimating the effect of roots on soil cohesion by assuming that during failure the roots break at the same time (Bischetti et al. 2009; Schwarz et al. 2013) or that roots are oriented perpendicular to the slip surface (Nghiem et al. 2003; Pollen and Simon 2005; Danjon et al. 2007). Quantifying the exact additional soil shear strength gained by the presence of roots is difficult to achieve.

For tree root systems, there must be a distinction between thin roots (<10 mm) and thick roots (>10 mm). When soil failure occurs, thin roots can act as flexible elements of a mesh to contain soil, and the thick roots of trees can act as structural pillars adding longitudinal strength (Reubens et al. 2007). Previous research efforts indicate that thin roots are significantly stronger than thick roots, mainly because of differences in cellulose content (Genet et al. 2005). Some thin roots showed tensile strength values over 700 MPa, surprisingly stronger than steel (Bischetti et al. 2005). Therefore, the thickness of roots and how flexible the roots can be is a very important factor to consider, as it can indicate their ability to penetrate soil and reinforce it against failures.

Soil characteristics vary widely across regions and are highly susceptible to rapid modification under anthropogenic disturbances and meteorological events. As a result, estimating root reinforcement potential while assuming that plant species behave similarly across different soil types can lead to significant underestimation or overestimation of their capacity as soil bioengineering agents.

Therefore, advancing this field requires the development of local databases documenting the mechanical properties of native plant species. Such information can subsequently be integrated with local soil characteristics and root area estimations from the sites to enable a more accurate assessment of their potential for use in soil bioengineering strategies aimed at stabilizing degraded mountainous regions.

Consequently, the main objective of this study is to estimate the mechanical properties—tensile strength and elasticity—of thin roots from tree species across three distinct vegetation communities distributed along an elevational gradient.

## Methods

### Study area

The study area is in the Natural Protected Area Altas Cumbres in Ciudad Victoria, Tamaulipas, Mexico. The altitude fluctuates between 350 m a.s.l. and 2180 m a.s.l. The highest elevation is found in the northwest, and the lowest elevation is in the eastern part of the area. The Natural Protected Area Altas Cumbres covers around 30,327.85 hectares and was declared in 1997 with the purpose of protecting and conserving the hydrological watershed, vegetation species, and biodiversity. The geomorphology of the area is characterized by secondary limestone formations folded into sharp anticlines and synclines. The mountain range is rugged and highly dissected along most of its length, with less pronounced escarpments toward the north. Slopes range from 0° to 58°, creating zones with high susceptibility to landslides. The rich biodiversity of both plant and animal species further highlights the ecological value of the region and underscores its importance for conservation. The climate is highly variable depending on altitude, with a prevailing humid subtropical climate (Cwa) according to the Köppen climate classification. The average monthly temperature ranges from 20 °C to 35 °C, with occasional extreme values of 10 °C in January and 48 °C in July. The study was performed in three sampling sites: 1) Tropical semi-deciduous forest (TSdF) located at 23°45.30'N, 99°18.39'W at an altitude of 340 m a.s.l.; 2) Tamaulipan Thornscrub (TTS) located at 23°46.32'N, 99°14.96'W at an altitude of 550 m a.s.l.; 3) Oak–Pine Forest (OPF) located at 23°46.62'N, 99°12.55'W at an altitude of 1100 m a.s.l. (Fig. 1).

### Root sampling and processing

The tree specimens chosen were representative species of the area. The root system of the specimens was cleared from the soil. After the thin root area was completely exposed, it was examined for external damage, and segments of thin roots were collected for further analysis. The classification of roots in this study was defined based on Stokes's (2009) list of desirable plant root traits for protecting natural slopes, which follows the processes governing soil fixation and divides thin roots into three classes depending on diameter: fine roots (>0.0–2.0 mm), thin roots (>2.0–10.0 mm), and thick roots (>10.0 mm). For this study, because of variation in root diameter among species, we statistically separated three categories of roots: small-diameter roots, medium-diameter roots, and large-diameter roots, all belonging to the thin part of the tree root system (Fig. 2). The contribution of thin tree roots is especially useful because, according to Dupuy et al. (2005), this group contributes to enhanced soil fixation due to bending and branching patterns.

The tests were carried out using a digital dynamometer with a 500 N capacity (Baoshishan ZP) placed on a test stand consisting of a clamp system on each side (Fig. 3). Root samples were positioned and clamped carefully to the experimental device at both extremities, avoiding damage to the root samples.





**Figure 1.** Study area and location of sampling sites. **A.** Location of Tamaulipas in Mexico; **B.** Location of the Natural Protected Area Altas Cumbres; **C.** Location of the sampling sites with different vegetation.




**Figure 2.** Diagram of the position of thin roots tested in this study.

The elastic properties of each root sample were determined using the following formula:

$$E = \frac{Ts/Cs}{L_1/L_0}$$

where Ts is the peak maximum force recorded by the dispositive, $C_s$ is the cross-sectional area, $L_1$ is the change of length of root sample, and $L_0$ is the original length (Fu et al. 2024).





**Figure 3.** Device used for testing. **A.** Dynamometer; **B.** Clamp system; **C.** Test stand.

Diameters were measured with a digital caliper (Mitutoyo) at three different points (upper, middle, and lower) to calculate a mean diameter corresponding to the breaking point of the samples. A constant speed of 10 mm/min was maintained for each test, and the dynamometer recorded the maximum tensile strength at root breakage.

## Tree species

The tree species selected were healthy and growing on the slopes of the study area. For the taxonomic identification of the specimens, the work of Stubbendieck et al. (2003) was consulted. Likewise, the botanical nomenclature was homogenized using the International Plant Name Index (International Plant Name Index 2023).

The description of the species found in the study sites is as follows:

*Ficus cotinifolia* Kunth (common name: amate) is a tree that can reach a height of 20 m, beginning as an epiphyte and becoming a strangler. Young branches are ribbed, floppy, and light gray. Leaves are obovate, ovate to elliptic, 5.5–13 cm long, and 3.5–6.5 cm broad. It is distributed in warm climates and is usually associated with disturbed vegetation of tropical deciduous forest (Ibarra-Manríquez 1992; Piedra-Malagon et al. 2006).

*Annona globiflora* Schltdl. (common name: anona) is a small tree of 1–4 m tall. Young branches, buds, and petioles are densely pubescent, with brownish trichomes that are appressed or slightly raised. Persistent leaves are 4–8 cm long and 1–3 cm wide, rounded at the base. It is frequent in tropical deciduous forests and can be found with flowers and some fruits from April to August and only with fruits toward the end of the year (Ortiz-Rodriguez et al. 2015).

*Taxodium mucronatum* Ten. (common name: ahuehuete) is a majestic-looking tree that reaches up to 40 m in height. It has light brown bark, straight leaves 8–200 mm long, and inflorescences 15–30 cm long. It is a species of riparian habitats with large water requirements, located in permanent or semi-permanent streams and occasionally in places without direct water contact but with a shallow groundwater table (Martínez-Sifuentes et al. 2021).

*Sommera grandis* Standl. (common name: palo colorado) is a tree that reaches a height of 8 m, with reddish-brown branches. Leaves have thick petioles of 0.8–2.5 cm, are light green and pale on the underside, and have subsessile flowers or a fruiting pedicel 3–8 mm long (Borhidi and Stranczinger 2012).

*Piper amalago* L. (common name: cordoncillo o higuillo de limón) is a small tree or shrub 1–6 m tall, profusely branched. Stems are green, internodes 3.5–5.5 cm long, and leaves are uniform in shape and size along all axes, symmetrical, and immensely ovate. It lives in warm, semi-warm, and temperate climates. It is a wild plant that grows along roads and is associated with disturbed vegetation of deciduous, subdeciduous, and evergreen tropical forests (Santos et al. 2015).

*Randia obcordata* S. Watson (common name: altanisa) is a small tree or shrub that grows primarily in the seasonally dry tropical biome. It is very dominant in Tamaulipan thornscrub, reaching heights of around 3 m (Villaseñor 2016).

*Celtis laevigata* Willd. (common name: palo blanco) is a medium-sized tree with narrow and jagged leaves. It grows in mountain zones, and the leaves contain chemicals that inhibit the germination of other plant species (Midolo 2024).

*Zanthoxylum fagara* L. Sarg. (common name: limoncillo) is a tree belonging to the family Rutaceae. It reaches up to 30 m in height. Its trunk is covered by abundant, very strong conical spines. Leaves are spirally arranged and have 3–7 leaflets. It inhabits regions from Mexico to Central America (Valdes-Alameda et al. 2020)

*Karwinskia humboldtiana* Schult. Zucc. (common name: tullidora) is a shrub or small tree 1–8 m tall, with a trunk that can measure 20 cm in diameter. Leaves are small (1–1.5 mm long), glossy green, paler below, with black spots on the main veins, opposite, and with linear stipules. It is found in various habitats, from deciduous tropical forest and dry scrub to oak forest and grasslands, between 250 and 2200 m a.s.l. (Fernandez-Nava 1996).

*Quercus rysophylla* Weath. (common name: encino colorado) is an evergreen tree of rapid growth that can reach 25 m in height. Leaves are alternate, simple, rigid, and elliptic, 7–25 cm long and 2–8 cm wide. Acorns are ovoid, mucronate, and glabrous at maturity, 1–1.7 cm long, single or in pairs, and sessile. The cupola, golden-colored and silky when young, occupies one-third of the acorn and matures after 2 years. This species is endemic to Mexico and found mostly at mid-altitudes in the Sierra Madre Oriental (Sanchez-Castillo et al. 2016).

*Pinus teocote* Schltdl. & Cham. (common name: ocote) is an evergreen tree that reaches 10–20 m in height, with a canopy 12–14 m wide and a trunk 0.65 m in diameter. The bark is fissured and grayish brown; leaves are 10–15 cm long. The fruits are ovoid cones 3.5–6.5 cm long. Naturally, its foliage tends to be rounded, but in cultivation it can take on different shapes (Farjon et al. 1997).

*Liquidambar styraciflua* L. (common name: liquidambar) is a medium- to tall-sized tree, 20–35 m but occasionally up to 41 m, with a trunk up to 1 m (and sometimes more than 2 m) in diameter. Leaves are palmate and lobed, 7–19 cm long and broad. It was well known as a medicinal plant by Native Americans.

## Data analysis

The values of tensile strength (Ts) and elasticity (E) of the roots recorded were classified into three categories according to root diameter (Dm); this was done for each of the selected species using Sturges' rule. Subsequently, to identify

which of the recorded variables (Ts or E) had the greatest correlation with respect to Dm, a Spearman correlation analysis was carried out. This analysis was performed in the Statistica 13.3 program (TIBCO Software Inc. 2017). To identify the species that best characterize each Dm category, a non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) analysis was performed using Euclidean distance as the similarity matrix. A PERMANOVA was also performed to test differences in species composition between sites. Both analyses were performed using the Vegan package (Oksanen et al. 2019) in R 3.5.3.

## Results

A total of 224 roots from 12 tree species were evaluated, corresponding to 12 genera and 11 families. Five species belong to the TSdF, four to the TTS, and three to the OPF. *Piper amalago* L. turned out to be the species with the highest Ts for the TSdF, while *Randia obcordata* S. Watson was the species with the highest Ts for the TTS, and *Pinus teocote* Schltdl. & Cham. for the OPF. On the other hand, for E, the species with the highest values for both the TSdF and OPF were the same: *Piper amalago* L. for the TSdF and *Pinus teocote* Schltdl.

**Table 1.** Parameters evaluated by species in the Peregrina Canyon, Mexico. LDm = Large diameter; MDm = Medium diameter; SDm = Small diameter.

| Taxon | Diameter Min | Diameter Max | Ts | E |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **TSdF** | | | | |
| **Annonaceae Juss.** | | | | |
| *Annona globiflora* Schltdl. (Aglo) | | | | |
| SDm | 1.50 | 2.23 | 31.59 | 327.13 |
| MDm | 2.23 | 2.97 | 14.60 | 127.42 |
| LDm | 2.97 | 3.70 | 8.30 | 24.72 |
| **Moraceae Gaudich.** | | | | |
| *Ficus cotinifolia* Kunth (Fcot) | | | | |
| SDm | 2.10 | 2.97 | 54.82 | 240.11 |
| MDm | 2.97 | 3.83 | 60.60 | 283.55 |
| LDm | 3.83 | 4.70 | 42.11 | 75.12 |
| **Piperaceae Giseke** | | | | |
| *Piper amalago* L. (Pama) | | | | |
| SDm | 2.30 | 3.70 | 99.80 | 640.88 |
| MDm | 3.70 | 5.10 | 102.40 | 161.32 |
| LDm | 5.10 | 6.50 | 83.25 | 117.62 |
| **Rubiaceae Juss.** | | | | |
| *Sommera grandis* (Bartl. ex DC.) Standl. (Sgra) | | | | |
| SDm | 1.30 | 2.87 | 54.96 | 361.59 |
| MDm | 2.87 | 4.43 | 36.10 | 116.22 |
| LDm | 4.43 | 6.00 | 21.17 | 44.16 |
| **Cupressaceae Gray** | | | | |
| *Taxodium mucronatum* Ten. (Tmuc) | | | | |
| SDm | 1.50 | 3.20 | 72.90 | 550.32 |
| MDm | 3.20 | 4.90 | 61.42 | 116.93 |

| Taxon | Diameter Min | Diameter Max | Ts | E |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| LDm | 4.90 | 6.60 | 48.45 | 101.51 |
| **TTS** | | | | |
| **Cannabaceae Martinov** | | | | |
| *Celtis laevigata* Willd. (Clae) | | | | |
| SDm | 2.00 | 3.30 | 33.57 | 223.36 |
| MDm | 3.30 | 4.60 | 22.83 | 58.76 |
| LDm | 4.60 | 5.90 | 21.42 | 24.81 |
| **Rhamnaceae Juss.** | | | | |
| *Karwinskia humboldtiana* (Schult.) Zucc. (Khum) | | | | |
| SDm | 2.00 | 3.00 | 41.23 | 267.35 |
| MDm | 3.00 | 4.00 | 22.68 | 60.88 |
| LDm | 4.00 | 5.00 | 22.36 | 41.11 |
| **Rubiaceae Juss.** | | | | |
| *Randia obcordata* S. Watson (Robc) | | | | |
| SDm | 2.00 | 3.00 | 45.95 | 201.39 |
| MDm | 3.00 | 4.00 | 28.83 | 75.07 |
| LDm | 4.00 | 5.00 | 25.48 | 74.31 |
| **Rutaceae Juss.** | | | | |
| *Zanthoxylum fagara* (L.) Sarg. (Zfag) | | | | |
| SDm | 1.60 | 2.97 | 33.63 | 181.50 |
| MDm | 2.97 | 4.33 | 45.00 | 83.75 |
| LDm | 4.33 | 5.70 | 19.72 | 17.75 |
| **OPF** | | | | |
| **Altingiaceae Horan.** | | | | |
| *Liquidambar styraciflua* L. (Lsty) | | | | |
| SDm | 2.20 | 3.27 | 38.41 | 133.31 |
| MDm | 3.27 | 4.33 | 14.40 | 23.64 |
| LDm | 4.33 | 5.40 | 30.78 | 38.14 |
| **Pinaceae Spreng. ex Rudolphi** | | | | |
| *Pinus teocote* Schltdl. & Cham. (Pteo) | | | | |
| SDm | 1.40 | 2.87 | 51.94 | 415.84 |
| MDm | 2.87 | 4.33 | 33.88 | 114.72 |
| LDm | 4.33 | 5.80 | 19.42 | 48.63 |
| **Fagaceae Dumort.** | | | | |
| *Quercus rysophylla* Weath. (Qrys) | | | | |
| SDm | 1.40 | 2.60 | 39.05 | 319.77 |
| MDm | 2.60 | 3.80 | 28.26 | 86.12 |
| LDm | 3.80 | 5.00 | 29.48 | 58.41 |

& Cham. for the OPF. However, for the TTS, *Karwinskia humboldtiana* (Schult.) Zucc. turned out to be the species with the highest E recorded (Table 1).

The E was the variable that best correlated with root diameter. This correlation turned out to be negative but significant ($p < 0.05$).

The PERMANOVA test detected significant differences in species composition among all sites (SStotal = 1366000; SSwithin-group = 628500; $F = 3.52$, $P < 0.001$). The sampled plant communities formed separate groups in the NMDS diagram (Stress = 0.11) (Fig. 4). *Piper amalago* L., *Sommera grandis* (Bartl. ex DC.) Standl., and *Taxodium mucronatum* Ten. were the species with the highest





**Figure 4.** NMDS for plant species elasticity by root diameter categories. TSdF (green), TTS (yellow), and OPF (red). The meaning of the abbreviations is presented in Table 1.

**Table 2.** Order of maximum values recorded for tensile strength and E of each species.

| | Dm | TSdF |
|---|---|---|
| **Ts** | S | *Piper amalago >Taxodium mucronatum > Sommera grandis > Ficus cornifolia > Annona globiflora* |
| | M | *Piper amalago > Taxodium mucronatum > Ficus cornifolia > Sommera grandis > Annona globiflora* |
| | L | *Piper amalago > Taxodium mucronatum > Ficus cornifolia > Sommera grandis > Annona globiflora* |
| **E** | S | *Piper amalago > Taxodium mucronatum > Sommera grandis > Annona globiflora > Ficus cornifolia* |
| | M | *Ficus cornifolia > Taxodium mucronatum > Piper amalago > Sommera grandis > Annona globiflora* |
| | L | *Piper amalago > Taxodium mucronatum > Ficus cornifolia > Sommera grandis > Annona globiflora* |
| | **Dm** | **TTS** |
| **Ts** | S | *Randia obcordata > Karwinskia humboldtiana > Zanthoxylum fagara > Celtis laevigata* |
| | M | *Zanthoxylum fagara > Randia obcordata > Celtis laevigata > Karwinskia humboldtiana* |
| | L | *Randia obcordata > Karwinskia humboldtiana > Celtis laevigata > Zanthoxylum fagara* |
| **E** | S | *Karwinskia humboldtiana > Celtis laevigata > Randia obcordata > Zanthoxylum fagara* |
| | M | *Zanthoxylum fagara > Randia obcordata > Karwinskia humboldtiana > Celtis laevigata* |
| | L | *Randia obcordata > Karwinskia humboldtiana > Celtis laevigata > Zanthoxylum fagara* |
| | **Dm** | **OPF** |
| **Ts** | S | *Liquidambar styraciflua > Quercus rysophylla > Pinus teocote* |
| | M | *Pinus teocote > Quercus rysophylla > Liquidambar styraciflua* |
| | L | *Liquidambar styraciflua > Quercus rysophylla > Pinus teocote* |
| **E** | S | *Pinus teocote > Quercus rysophylla > Liquidambar styraciflua* |
| | M | *Pinus teocote > Quercus rysophylla > Liquidambar styraciflua* |
| | L | *Quercus rysophylla > Pinus teocote > > Liquidambar styraciflua* |

E and small Dm in the TSdF. On the other hand, *Celtis laevigata* Willd. and *Karwinskia humboldtiana* (Schult.) Zucc. were the species with the highest E and small Dm in the TTS. The species in the OPF with the highest E and small Dm were *Liquidambar styraciflua* L. and *Quercus rysophylla* Weath. (Fig. 4).





**Figure 5.** The regression analysis for the three sampling sites fitted a power-law relationship. AG = *Annona globiflora*, FC = *Ficus cotinifolia*, PA = *Piper amalago*, SG = *Sommera grandis*, TM = *Taxodium mucronatum*, CL = *Celtis laevigata*, KH = *Karwinskia humboldtiana*, RO = *Randia obcordata*, ZF = *Zanthoxylum fagara*, LS = *Liquidambar styraciflua*, PT = *Pinus teocote*, QR = *Quercus rysophylla*.

The regression analysis for the three sampling sites fitted a power-law relationship, suggesting that changes in the response variable occur proportionally to a power of the predictor variable rather than in a constant linear pattern (Fig. 5).

The order of maximum to minimum values of tensile strength and elasticity for each species in each diameter category across the three different vegetation types is shown in Table 2. The order shows that *Piper amalago* dominates the maximum values of Ts and E in most diameter categories in the tropical semi-deciduous forest, while in the Tamaulipan thornscrub, *Randia obcordata* and *Karwinskia humboldtiana* alternate among the maximum values. On the other hand, *Liquidambar styraciflua* and *Pinus teocote* share the maximum values across different diameter categories.

## Discussion

We investigated the variation of the mechanical properties of thin tree roots, divided into three diameter categories, across three different vegetation communities along an altitudinal gradient. For this study, we used our own classification, statistically partitioning diameters of each species following Sturges' rule. This approach allowed us to account for morphological differences among species and to ensure better comparability, especially in mixed-species datasets (Freschet et al. 2021a; Freschet et al. 2021b). However, the classification of roots remains a complex task because many factors, such as species identity, root morphology, and phenological stage, influence diameter distribution and related properties. In the literature, classification methods vary widely, from personal preferences, fixed-size intervals, and whole-root-system perspectives to more functional or topological approaches (Gu et al. 2017; Liu et al. 2018; Freschet et al. 2021b; Bi et al. 2023). Nevertheless, a careful and standardized classification step is crucial when analyzing diverse vegetation communities, as it strongly influences the interpretation of mechanical properties. Across the tropical semi-deciduous forest (TSdF), Tamaulipan thornscrub (TTS), and oak–pine forest (OPF), thin-root tensile strength (Ts) declined systematically with diameter, while elastic modulus (E) showed clear species- and community-level contrasts. These patterns confirm that properties of thin roots (2–10 mm) are ecologically structured and relevant to shallow landslide initiation zones, and they reveal species that combine high Ts at small diameters with comparatively stiff responses (higher E).

Altitudinal gradients are well known to affect root properties and plant development due to differences in temperature, precipitation, soil pH, nutrients, and minerals, which vary with altitude, thereby modifying the soil environment. Thus, the assessment of plant species' root systems represents a fundamental trait for understanding the contribution of vegetation to reducing shallow landslide instabilities at different altitudes. The measurements of those properties present wide variability in the literature and are affected by uncertainties due to measurement methods and natural variation among plant species. Although studies of root mechanical properties of different species along altitudinal gradients are scarce, some highlight interesting results. Qi et al. (2025) found that species at lower elevations show advantageous morphological characteristics, while roots at higher elevations show greater tensile strength, which can result in more resistant roots. By contrast, Weemstra et al. (2020) found that variation in root properties depends more on small-scale heterogeneity than on large-scale environmental variation. However, in our study, the results for thin roots did not show any trend across the altitudinal gradient. This is consistent with the difference in species composition among vegetation communities and with the notion that species identity and local heterogeneity can override broad elevational signals. Importantly, besides tensile strength (Ts), our measurements of elastic modulus (E) also varied among species and communities, highlighting that both Ts and E are needed to characterize reinforcement potential.

The climate and environment of mountainous regions are unique. Elevation can change temperature and humidity, affecting soil organisms and the presence and performance of vegetation species. Plant species richness, growth, and vegetation type are influenced by climatic limitations. For example, it is well known that the number of tree, shrub, and understory species is reduced as elevation increas-

es (Klimek et al. 2020; Staszel et al. 2022). Furthermore, the growth, morphology, and biomass of thin roots tend to decrease at higher elevations (Finér et al. 2011; Kotas et al. 2018; Sierra-Cornejo et al. 2020). Those changes in root structure have direct implications for their mechanical properties. Reports from other regions suggest that higher elevations often promote the development of finer roots with increased tensile strength, enhancing their ability to resist breakage under soil movement and contributing more effectively to soil reinforcement. Elasticity, on the other hand, determines how much roots can stretch without breaking. The balance between tensile strength and elasticity is therefore crucial for understanding root contributions to slope stability along altitudinal gradients, as roots must be strong enough to anchor soil yet flexible enough to adapt to ground movement. Our findings of community-specific Ts and E, but no consistent elevational trend for thin roots, indicate that species turnover and local site conditions may shape this balance more strongly than elevation alone at the spatial scale of our study.

The relationship between root diameter and tensile strength is well established: thinner roots often exhibit higher tensile strength due to greater cellulose concentration per cross-sectional area, following a negative power-law relationship (De Baets et al. 2008; Meijer 2024). However, in mixed-species environments, species-specific morphology and adaptive strategies can obscure these general trends. Consistent with this expectation, our data did not reveal a consistent tensile strength pattern across diameter classes along the altitudinal gradient, suggesting that species turnover and functional trait diversity between vegetation zones may override altitude-driven patterns. Moreover, incorporating E alongside Ts clarifies that stiffness differences among species can alter how load is shared within the soil–root composite during shear, even when Ts is similar. Overall, the species-resolved Ts–Dm and E–Dm relationships presented here are directly usable for parameterizing root-reinforcement formulations and for identifying candidate species within each vegetation community, while acknowledging that local architecture (density, orientation) and site conditions will govern net reinforcement at the slope scale.

## Conclusion

Our study demonstrates that the mechanical properties (Ts and E) of thin roots vary significantly among species across three vegetation types along an altitudinal gradient. While species such as *Piper amalago* and *Pinus teocote* consistently exhibited high Ts and E values, the absence of a consistent altitudinal trend suggests that local site conditions and species-specific traits have a stronger influence on root mechanics than elevation alone. Elasticity showed the strongest negative correlation with root diameter, highlighting the importance of fine root characteristics in mechanical performance.

These findings underscore the importance of accounting for species identity and root morphology when assessing root contributions to soil reinforcement and slope stability. Given the variability in mechanical traits across communities, especially in mixed-species systems, a standardized classification of root diameter and function is essential. Understanding these differences is crucial for improving models of vegetation–soil interaction and for designing effective nature-based solutions in erosion-prone or mountainous environments.

## Additional information

### Conflict of interest

The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

### Ethical statement

No ethical statement was reported.

### Use of AI

No use of AI was reported.

### Funding

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

### Author contributions

All authors of this manuscript participated in a relevant manner in the research and meet the criteria for authorship.

### Author ORCIDs

Laura Sanchez-Castillo https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1028-2449
Edmar Melendez-Jaramillo https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9054-2572
Santos Daniel Chicas https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0408-4171
Ma. Teresa de Jesus Segura Martinez https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8559-3885
Marisol Gonzalez-Delgado https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8442-7903

### Data availability

All of the data that support the findings of this study are available in the main text.

## References

Abdi E, Saleh HR, Majnonian B, Deljouei A (2018) Soil fixation and erosion control by *Haloxylon persicum* roots in arid lands, Iran. Journal of Arid Land 11: 86–96. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40333-018-0021-2

Bi L, Xing L, Liang H, Lin J (2023) Estimation of coarse root system diameter based on Ground-Penetrating Radar forward modeling. Forests 14: 1370. https://doi.org/10.3390/f14071370

Bischetti GB, Chiaradia EA, Epis T, Morlotti E (2009) Root cohesion of forest species in the Italian Alps. Plant and Soil 324: 71–89. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-009-9941-0

Bischetti GB, Chiaradia EA, Simonato T, Speziali B, Vitali B, Vullo P, Zocco A (2005) Root strength and root area ratio of forest species in Lombardy (Northern Italy). Plant and Soil 278: 11–22. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-005-0605-4

Bischetti GB, Di Fi Dio M, Florineth F (2012) On the Origin of Soil Bioengineering. Landscape Research 39: 583–595. https://doi.org/10.1080/01426397.2012.730139

Borhidi A, Stranczinger S (2012) Combinaciones Nuevas en la Familia Rubiaceae de la Flora de México. Acta Botanica Hungarica 54: 81–84. https://doi.org/10.1556/abot.54.2012.1-2.9

Cao Y, Su X, Zhou Z, Liu J, Chen M, Wang N, Zhu B, Wang P, Liu F (2025) Effects of root traits on shear performance of root-soil complex and soil reinforcement in the Loess Plateau. Soil & Tillage Research 252: 106625. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2025.106625

Danjon F, Barker DH, Drexhage M, Stokes A (2007) Using three-dimensional plant root architecture in models of shallow-slope stability. Annals of Botany 101: 1281–1293. https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcm199

De Baets S, Poesen J, Reubens B, Wemans K, De Baerdemaeker J, Muys B (2008) Root tensile strength and root distribution of typical Mediterranean plant species and their contribution to soil shear strength. Plant and Soil 305: 207–226. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-008-9553-0

Dupuy L, Fourcaud T, Stokes A (2005) A Numerical Investigation into the Influence of Soil Type and Root Architecture on Tree Anchorage. Plant and Soil 278: 119–134. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-005-7577-2

Farjon A, De La Rosa Jorge AP, Styles BT, Wise R (1997) A field guide to the pines of Mexico and Central America. Medical Entomology and Zoology. http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA62371490

Fernandez-Nava R (1996) Dos nuevas especies de Rhamnus (Rhamnaceae) de Oaxaca, Mexico. Polibotánica: 2–6. http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=62100101

Finér L, Ohashi M, Noguchi K, Hirano Y (2011) Fine root production and turnover in forest ecosystems in relation to stand and environmental characteristics. Forest Ecology and Management 262: 2008–2023. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2011.08.042

Flepp G, Robyr R, Scotti R, Giadrossich F, Conedera M, Vacchiano G, Fischer C, Ammann P, May D, Schwarz M (2021) Temporal dynamics of root reinforcement in European spruce forests. Forests 12: 815. https://doi.org/10.3390/f12060815

Freschet GT, Pagès L, Iversen CM, Comas LH, Rewald B, Roumet C, Klimešová J, Zadworny M, Poorter H, Postma JA, Adams TS, Bagniewska-Zadworna A, Bengough AG, Blancaflor EB, Brunner I, Cornelissen JHC, Garnier E, Gessler A, Hobbie SE, Meier IC, Mommer L, Picon-Cochard C, Rose L, Ryser P, Scherer-Lorenzen M, Soudzilovskaia NA, Stokes A, Sun T, Valverde-Barrantes OJ, Weemstra M, Weigelt A, Wurzburger N, York LM, Batterman SA, de Moraes MG, Janeček Š, Lambers H, Salmon V, Tharayil N, McCormack ML (2021a) A starting guide to root ecology: Strengthening ecological concepts and standardising root classification, sampling, processing and trait measurements. The New Phytologist 232: 973–1122. https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.17572

Freschet GT, Roumet C, Comas LH, Weemstra M, Bengough AG, Rewald B, Bardgett RD, De Deyn GB, Johnson D, Klimešová J, Lukac M, McCormack ML, Meier IC, Pagès L, Poorter H, Prieto I, Wurzburger N, Zadworny M, Bagniewska-Zadworna A, Blancaflor EB, Brunner I, Gessler A, Hobbie SE, Iversen CM, Mommer L, Picon-Cochard C, Postma JA, Rose L, Ryser P, Scherer-Lorenzen M, Soudzilovskaia NA, Sun T, Valverde-Barrantes OJ, Weigelt A, York LM, Stokes A (2021b) Root traits as drivers of plant and ecosystem functioning: Current understanding, pitfalls and future research needs. The New Phytologist 232: 1123–1158. https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.17072

Fu J, Zhou Z, Guo H, Zhao J, Yu D, Wu J, Hu X (2024) Biomechanical behavior of grass roots at different gauge lengths. Journal of Mountain Science 21: 3201–3214. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11629-023-8474-y

Genet M, Stokes A, Fourcaud T, Hu X, Lu Y (2006) Soil fixation by tree roots: changes in root reinforcement parameters with age in *Cryptomeria japonica* D. Don. plantations. Interpraevent, 25–27.

Genet M, Stokes A, Salin F, Mickovski SB, Fourcaud T, Dumail J-F, Van Beek R (2005) The influence of cellulose content on tensile strength in tree roots. Plant and Soil 278: 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-005-8768-6

Gobinath R, Ganapathy GP, Gayathiri E, Salunkhe AA, Pourghasemi HR (2022) Ecoengineering practices for soil degradation protection of vulnerable hill slopes. Elsevier eBooks, 255–270. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-323-89861-4.00002-6

Gu J, Wang Y, Fahey TJ, Wang Z (2017) Effects of root diameter, branch order, soil depth and season of birth on fine root life span in five temperate tree species. European Journal of Forest Research 136: 727–738. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10342-017-1068-x

Hao H-X, Qin J-H, Sun Z-X, Guo Z-L, Wang J-G (2021) Erosion-reducing effects of plant roots during concentrated flow under contrasting textured soils. Catena 203: 105378. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2021.105378

Huang J-K, Dai J-P, Scarpa F, Wang Y-Q, Ji J-N, Mao Z (2025) Random root distribution affects the mechanical properties of the soil-root composite and root reinforcement. Catena 255: 108896. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2025.108896

Ibarra-Manríquez G (1992) Fenología de las palmas de una selva cálido húmeda de México. Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Études Andines 21: 669–683. https://doi.org/10.3406/bifea.1992.1080

International Plant name Index (2023) International Plant Names Index. The Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Harvard University Herbaria & Libraries, and Australian National Herbarium. http://www.ipni.org [Accessed on: September 2023]

Jiang Z, Cui D, Yang Y, Liu W, Zinhar Z, Yan J, Liu J, Cao J, Zhang M, Wang Q (2024) Characteristics of soil arthropod communities and soil health in 'Shushanggan' apricot forests after soil bioengineering remediation in the riparian zone of the Ili River Valley evaluation. Ecological Engineering 212: 107505. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2024.107505

Kettenhuber PLW, Sousa RDS, Dewes JJ, Rauch HP, Sutili FJ, Hörbinger S (2022) Performance assessment of a soil and water bioengineering work on the basis of the flora development and its associated ecosystem processes. Ecological Engineering 186: 106840. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2022.106840

Klimek B, Jaźwa M, Choczyński M, Stolarczyk M, Niklińska M (2020) The drivers of soil microbial communities structure on forest stands along the altitudinal gradient in western carpathians. Acta Oecologica 108: 103643. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actao.2020.103643

Kong K, Deng Z, Chen F, Wang Z, Chen Y (2025) Numerical analysis of the effect of vegetation root reinforcement on the rainfall-induced instability of loess slopes. Scientific Reports 15: 23233. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-06400-3

Kotas P, Šantrůčková H, Elster J, Kaštovská E (2018) Soil microbial biomass, activity and community composition along altitudinal gradients in the High Arctic (Billefjorden, Svalbard). Biogeosciences 15: 1879–1894. https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-15-1879-2018

Liu S, Li J, Ji X, Fang Y (2022) Influence of root distribution patterns on soil dynamic characteristics. Scientific Reports 12: 13448. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-17828-2

Liu Y, Wang G, Yu K, Li P, Xiao L, Liu G (2018) A new method to optimize root order classification based on the diameter interval of fine root. Scientific Reports 8: 2960. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-21248-6

Martínez-Sifuentes AR, Villanueva-Díaz J, De La Rosa EC, Stahle DW (2021) Modelado actual y futuro de la idoneidad de hábitat el ahuehuete (*Taxodium mucronatum* Ten.): Una propuesta para conservación en México. Botanical Sciences 99: 752–770. https://doi.org/10.17129/botsci.2772

Masi EB, Segoni S, Tofani V (2021) Root reinforcement in slope stability models: A review. Geosciences 11(5): 212. https://doi.org/10.3390/geosciences11050212

Meijer GJ (2021) A generic form of fibre bundle models for root reinforcement of soil. Plant and Soil 468: 45–65. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-021-05039-z

Meijer GJ (2024) Improving power law fitting of root tensile strength–diameter relationships. Plant and Soil 511: 555–580. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-024-07007-9

Midolo G (2024) Plant functional traits couple with range size and shape in European trees. Global Ecology and Biogeography 33. https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.13838

Nghiem QM, Nakamura H, Shiraki K (2003) Analysis of root reinforcement at slip surface. Nihon Jisuberi Gakkaishi 40: 302–310. https://doi.org/10.3313/jls.40.4_302

Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Friendly M, Kindt R, Legendre P, McGlinn D, Minchin PR, O'Hara RB, Simpson GL, Solymos P, Stevens MHH, Szoecs E, Wagner H (2019) vegan: Community Ecology Package. R package version 2.5–4. https://CRAN.Rproject.org/package=vegan

Ortiz-Rodriguez AE, Sosa V, Ruiz-Sanchez E (2015) Flora del Bajío y de regiones adyacentes. Annonaceae. Instituto de Ecología AC, Pátzcuaro, Michoacán.

Piedra-Malagón EM, Rodríguez RR, Ibarra-Manríquez G (2006) El género Ficus (Moraceae) en el estado de Morelos, México. Acta Botánica Mexicana 45–75. https://doi.org/10.21829/abm75.2006.1014

Pollen N, Simon A (2005) Estimating the mechanical effects of riparian vegetation on stream bank stability using a fiber bundle model. Water Resources Research 41. https://doi.org/10.1029/2004wr003801

Qi L, Hao T, Chen K, Zheng L, Guan H, Zhou W, Yang J, Guan C (2025) Soil temperature elevation enhances phenanthrene phytoremediation by maize through improvement of plant growth and soil microbial activity. Plant Physiology and Biochemistry : PPB 223: 109844. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plaphy.2025.109844

Reubens B, Poesen J, Danjon F, Geudens G, Muys B (2007) The role of fine and coarse roots in shallow slope stability and soil erosion control with a focus on root system architecture: A review. Trees (Berlin) 21: 385–402. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00468-007-0132-4

Romano G, Ricci GF, Leronni V, Venerito P, Gentile F (2022) Soil bioengineering techniques for Mediterranean coastal dune restoration using autochthonous vegetation species. Journal of Coastal Conservation 26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11852-022-00912-0

Sanchez-Castillo L, Kubota T, Cantú-Silva I, Moriyama T, Hasnawir N (2016) A probability method of rainfall warning for sediment-related disaster in developing countries: A case study in Sierra Madre Oriental, Mexico. Natural Hazards 85: 1893–1906. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-016-2669-2

Santos VLPD, Franco CRC, Amano E, Messias-Reason IJ, Budel JM (2015) Anatomical investigations of Piper amalago (jaborandi-manso) for the quality control. Revista Brasileira de Farmacognosia 25: 85–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjp.2015.03.001

Schaller C, Dorren L, Cohen D, Seijmonsbergen AC, Van Loon EE (2025) Optimisation and application of a high-resolution shallow landslide model at regional scale. Natural Hazards 121: 22817–22849. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-025-07701-6

Schmidt KM, Roering JJ, Stock JD, Dietrich WE, Montgomery DR, Schaub T (2001) The variability of root cohesion as an influence on shallow landslide susceptibility in the Oregon Coast Range. Canadian Geotechnical Journal 38: 995–1024. https://doi.org/10.1139/t01-031

Schwarz, et al. (2013) Schwarz M, Giadrossich F, Cohen D (2013) Modeling root reinforcement using a root-failure Weibull survival function. Hydrology and Earth System Sciences 17: 4367–4377. https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-17-4367-2013

Sierra-Cornejo N, Hertel D, Becker JN, Hemp A, Leuschner C (2020) Biomass, morphology, and dynamics of the fine root system across a 3,000-M elevation gradient on Mt. Kilimanjaro. Frontiers in Plant Science 11: 13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.00013

Staszel K, Lasota J, Błońska E (2022) Soil organic matter fractions in relation to root characteristics of different tree species in altitude gradient of temperate forest in Carpathian mountains. Forests 13: 1656. https://doi.org/10.3390/f13101656

Stokes A, Atger C, Bengough AG, Fourcaud T, Sidle RC (2009) Desirable plant root traits for protecting natural and engineered slopes against landslides. Plant and Soil 324: 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-009-0159-y

Stubbendieck JL, Hatch SL, Landholt LM (2003) North American Wildland Plants: A Field Guide (6th ed.). University of Nebraska Press, Nebraska.

Su X, Zhou Z, Liu J, Cao L, Liu J, Wang P (2021) Estimating slope stability by the root reinforcement mechanism of Artemisia sacrorum on the Loess Plateau of China. Ecological Modelling 444: 109473. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2021.109473

Suresh K, Bhattacharyya S, Carvajal J, Ghosh R, Zeisler-Diehl VV, Böckem V, Nagel KA, Wojciechowski T, Schreiber L (2024) Effects of water stress on apoplastic barrier formation in soil grown roots differ from hydroponically grown roots: Histochemical, biochemical and molecular evidence. Plant Cell & Environment 47: 4917–4931. https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.15067

TIBCO Software Inc (2017) Statistica (data analysis software system): version 13.3. Palo Alto, CA. https://www.tibco.com/products/tibco-statistica

Valdes-Alameda R, Jurado E, Flores J, Pando-Moreno M, Estrada E, Gurvich DE (2020) Densidad de semillas y plántulas de Zanthoxylum fagara en México y Zanthoxylum coco en Argentina: Influencia de plantas bajo las cuales ocurren y borde de la vegetación. Botanical Sciences 99: 67–79. https://doi.org/10.17129/botsci.2636

Valizade N, Tabarsa A (2020) Laboratory investigation of plant root reinforcement on the mechanical behaviour and collapse potential of loess soil. European Journal of Environmental and Civil Engineering 26: 1475–1491. https://doi.org/10.1080/19648189.2020.1715848

Villaseñor JL (2016) Checklist of the native vascular plants of México. Revista Mexicana de Biodiversidad 87(3). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmb.2016.06.017

Weemstra M, Kiorapostolou N, Van Ruijven J, Mommer L, De Vries J, Sterck F (2020) The role of fine-root mass, specific root length and life span in tree performance: A whole-tree exploration. Functional Ecology 34: 575–585. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13520

Wu TH, McOmber RM, Erb RT, Beal PE (1988) Study of Soil-Root interaction. Journal of Geotechnical Engineering 114: 1351–1375. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9410(1988)114:12(1351)

Zhu J, El-Zein A, Hubble TCT, Miao G (2025) Effects of soil saturation and suction on root reinforcement performance: Pull-out experiments on six native Australian plants. Acta Geotechnica 20: 2075–2092. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11440-025-02603-0

Zhu J, Leung AK, Wang Y (2022) Modelling root–soil mechanical interaction considering root pull-out and breakage failure modes. Plant and Soil 480: 675–701. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-022-05613-z