



## Research article

# Floristic composition and phytosociology of various forage-based land-use systems in the Himalayas over an altitudinal gradient

P. L. Bhutia<sup>1,2\*</sup>, B. Gupta<sup>3</sup>, R. P. Yadav<sup>4</sup>, K. G. Bhutia<sup>5</sup>, Devideen Yadav<sup>6</sup> and Leishangthem Chanu Langlentombi<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>ICAR Research Complex for NEH Region, Nagaland Centre, Medziphema-797106, India

<sup>2</sup>ICAR-Indian Institute of Soil and Water Conservation, Chandigarh-160019, India

<sup>3</sup>Dr. Y.S. Parmar University of Horticulture and Forestry, Solan-173230, India

<sup>4</sup>Rani Lakshmi Bai Central Agricultural University, Jhansi-284003, India

<sup>5</sup>Rain Forest Research Institute, Jorhat-785001, India

<sup>6</sup>ICAR-Indian Institute of Soil and Water Conservation, Dehradun-248195, India

<sup>7</sup>ICAR- ICAR Research Complex for NEH Region, Manipur Centre, Imphal-795004, India

\*Corresponding author email: [pempadenzongpa66@gmail.com](mailto:pempadenzongpa66@gmail.com)

Received: 14<sup>th</sup> April, 2023

Accepted: 21<sup>st</sup> February, 2024

## Abstract

Systematic sampling method was used to study ground vegetation diversity and phytosociology of chir pine silvipasture (SPCP), mixed-trees silvipasture (SPM), ban oak silvipasture (SPBO) and grasslands (Gr) in the western Himalaya, India along an altitudinal gradient *viz.*, E<sub>1</sub> (<850 m), E<sub>2</sub> (851–1150 m), E<sub>3</sub> (1151–1450 m), E<sub>4</sub> (1451–1750 m) and E<sub>5</sub> (>1751 m). Ground vegetation belonging to 36 families, 106 genera, and 122 species were recorded, of which 68.85% of species belong to herbs and 31.15% belong to shrubs. Shannon-Wiener and Shannon evenness indices varied from 1.51 (Gr at E<sub>2</sub>) to 2.86 (SPM at E<sub>5</sub>), 0.46 (Gr at E<sub>2</sub>) to 0.80 (SPM at E<sub>4</sub>), for herbs; 1.91 (Gr at E<sub>1</sub>) to 2.78 (SPM at E<sub>5</sub>), 0.79 (SPCP at E<sub>1</sub>) to 0.92 (SPM at E<sub>3</sub>), for shrubs, respectively. The density and basal area of herbs were higher in grassland as compared to silvipasture systems, while it was *vice-versa* in the case of shrubs. These phytosociological characteristics of herbs and shrubs typically declined with elevation in all the land-use systems. Thus, silvipasture systems showed higher ground species diversity than grasslands. The phytosociological parameters of herbs were better in grasslands as compared to silvipastures. However, shrubs showed better growth parameters under silvipasture systems as compared to grasslands.

**Keywords:** Basal area, Diversity index, Floristic composition, Grassland, Silviculture

## Introduction

The Himalayas, one of the most biologically diverse regions in the world, is a treasure house for botanists. The presence of varied landforms, relief and environmental conditions makes this region suitable to support large numbers of land uses and vegetation. The structure of an ecosystem is largely determined by vegetation (Yadav *et al.*, 2020). Various factors determine the composition and structure of the community, as well as the diversity of associated species of mountain vegetation (Kunwar *et al.*, 2019). One of these factors is elevation, which influences the floral spectrum and soil properties of different land use (Bhutia *et al.*, 2021). Conversely, the temperature, humidity, soil composition and solar radiations are key variables in defining altitudinal zones, which support

specific microclimates and, consequently distinct land uses with particular vegetation patterns and soil properties. Many studies have documented altitudinal variation in vegetation type as a function of altitude shift (Adhikari *et al.*, 1992) and linked it to climate, habitat heterogeneity, biotic interaction, and history (Currie and Francis, 2004). Variations in species diversity along an elevation gradient have been studied multiple times. Maximum studies showed a hump-shaped distribution of species, reporting the higher species diversity near the mid of the elevation gradient (Kidane, 2019). However, several exceptions have been reported against the humped pattern (Da Silva Mota *et al.*, 2018). In general, increase or decrease in species diversity along an elevation gradient depends largely on interactions

among plant communities, environmental factors and management (Körner, 2007; Boscutti *et al.*, 2018).

Accurate assessment and understanding of vegetation and species diversity patterns in different land-use systems along elevations are vital for their sustainable management and utilization. It also assists in identifying the threats to biodiversity from advancing anthropogenic and climatic change, allowing strategies to be developed and implemented in the right perspective. In the Himalayas, semi-arid or arid regions, forage-based land use systems (LUS) are the foundation of rural subsistence, supplying critical fodder for their cattle, fuelwood for cooking in their homes, small timber for house construction and agriculture equipment, soil conservation and so on (Ram *et al.*, 2023). However, there was a lack of data/information on the structure and diversity of these LUS in this region. Hence, the current study focused on the ground floristic composition and phytosociological attributes of silvipastures (SP) and grassland (Gr) along an elevation gradient in India's north-western Himalayas.

## Materials and Methods

**Study area:** The study was conducted in Solan district, north-western Himalaya, India (latitude 30°40'–31°21'N and longitude 76.35'–77°15'E). The region has altitudes ranging from 360 to 2300 m above MSL. The soil is mainly neutral, ranging from sandy to clay loams, with shallow depth except in areas with vegetative cover. Solan district experiences a subtropical climate at lower elevations and wet temperate at higher reaches, receiving approximately 1420 mm of annual rainfall, mostly during the rainy season. Winter temperatures drop below 0°C in higher reaches, while summer temperatures reach around 38°C in lower areas. Vegetation distribution is influenced by temperature and moisture. Lower areas are characterized by dry mixed deciduous forests, mainly *Acacia catechu* and *Shorea robusta*. Chir pine forests (*Pinus roxburghii*) extend from lower to higher elevations, while Ban oak forests are found in specific areas. Higher altitudes feature oak mixed with conifers like *Deodar*. Natural grasslands and silvipastures exist throughout the district, differing in tree species composition along the altitudinal gradient.

**Site selection:** To conduct the study, the whole district was delineated into five elevation zones, *i.e.*, E<sub>1</sub>: <850 m; E<sub>2</sub>: 851–1150 m; E<sub>3</sub>: 1151–1450 m; E<sub>4</sub>: 1451–1750 m; E<sub>5</sub>: >1751 m. Six experimental sites (approx. 1-km<sup>2</sup> area each) were randomly selected at each elevation zone. Forage-based land-use system *viz.*, chir pine silvipasture (SPCP), mixed-trees silvipasture (SPM) and ban oak silvipasture (SPBO) and grasslands (Gr) were selected to study the ground vegetation characteristics. SPCP, SPM and Gr were present in all the elevation zones whereas SPBO was present only in the upper three elevation zones.

**Floristic composition and phytosociology:** In each selected land-use system, six quadrats of 100 m<sup>2</sup> size were laid out to study shrubs during the year 2017–18 growing season. Several shrub species in each plot were counted, and their density was determined. Based on visual appearance, each shrubs species was differentiated into different groups and in each, the number of plants was counted. A proportionate sampling method was used to sample shrubs from each group to determine the stem basal area of different species. Similarly, to study herbaceous vegetation 6 quadrats of 50 × 50 cm size (standardized through species-area curve method) were randomly laid out to uproot herbage from each of them at the time of peak growth of herbage. The number of herbage species in each quadrat was counted and segregated into grass, sedge, legume, and forb. The tillers of each grass species were counted, and their basal area was determined at ground level. The number of individual plants in each species was counted for herb species other than grasses to determine their density. The individual species density, frequency, basal area and importance value index (IVI) of both shrubs and herbaceous vegetation were determined (Mishra, 1969). The field survey included 648 plots of 10 × 10 m and 50 cm × 50 cm size quadrats to study shrubs and herbs, respectively. All specimens of plants were identified at the University Herbarium, Department of Forest Products, Dr. Yashwant Singh Parmar University of Horticulture and Forestry, Solan and Systematic Botany Division in Forest Research Institute, Dehradun.

**Vegetation indices:** The Shannon-Wiener, Shannon evenness and Species richness indices were computed.

**Statistical analysis:** The data obtained were analyzed using JMP 10-SAS software. Data on density and basal area of ground vegetation were analyzed by analysis of variance (ANOVA), and least square (LS) means were compared by Tukey HSD test ( $p < 0.05$ ).

## Results and Discussion

**Floristic composition:** The ground plant richness in SP and Gr swathes 36 families, 106 genera and 122 species, of which 68.85% belonged to herbaceous vegetation and 31.15% species belonged to shrubs. Among different LUS, the ground floral spectrum of SPCP comprised of 32 plant families, 93 genera and 105 species (28 grasses, six sedges, 29 forbs, seven legumes, 35 shrubs). In SPM, ground flora belonging to 33 families, 93 genera and 104 species (27 grasses, seven sedges, 30 forbs, five legumes, 35 shrubs) were recorded, while in SPBO, it was comprised of 33 families, 85 genera, and 92 species (19 grasses, six sedges, 32 forbs, seven legumes, 28 shrubs). However, grassland vegetation comprised of 30 plant families, 86 genera and 97 species (25 grasses, six sedges, 30 forbs,

four legumes and 32 shrubs). The findings demonstrated that the ground floristic composition in SP and Gr of Solan district is diversified, with numerous species exhibiting broad ecological amplitude and occupying a variety of ecological niches. These vegetation systems are stable communities with consistent change because they have developed through time under specific climatic circumstances and are a function of time, height, slope, latitude, aspect, rainfall, and humidity in a given location. Despite this, these systems are not indestructible and are vulnerable to biotic perturbations as well as global climate change.

The number of plants recorded in the present investigation was similar to the results of vegetation of the Himalayas reported earlier (Srivastav et al., 2015; Hussain et al., 2019). Few reports have indicated the presence of more plant genera, species, and families in Himalayan vegetation (Chandra et al., 2010; Dar and Sundarapandian, 2016). These workers might have investigated large areas and studied all types of land uses, including forests, non-agricultural land, barren and unculturable lands, which were excluded in our study. Prevailing management inputs also govern differences in floral diversity and habitat condition of any area (Hailu, 2017).

It was inferred that most of the species were represented by a few plant families like Poaceae, Asteraceae, Lamiaceae, Fabaceae and Cyperaceae, comparable to the results of Srivastav *et al.* (2015) and Gupta *et al.* (2015) in the Himalayas (Table 1). More species from only a

few families in any area is a manifestation of existing germplasm and the successful adaptation of its species to the environment. Due to the number of species from only a few families, the herbaceous population exhibited the following four main plant categories: grasses, sedges, legumes and forbs. The ground plant categories were the same in silvipasture systems and grasslands, but the number of plant genera or species varied. The number of species in herbaceous plant categories followed the decreasing precedence: forbs > grasses > legumes > sedges.

**Vegetation indices:** Shannon Wiener Index for herbaceous vegetation in different LUS of Solan district varied from 1.51 in Gr at E<sub>2</sub> to 2.86 in SPM at E<sub>5</sub>, whereas for shrubs, it varied from 1.91 in Gr at E<sub>1</sub> to 2.78 in SPM at E<sub>5</sub>. Shannon Evenness Index for herbaceous vegetation and shrubs at different elevations also showed a similar trend, with the value ranged from 0.46 in Gr at E<sub>2</sub> to 0.80 in SPM at E<sub>4</sub> and 0.79 in SPCP at E<sub>1</sub> and 0.92 in SPM at E<sub>3</sub>, respectively (Table 1).

The results showed that all the vegetation indices were higher in mixed-tree silvipastures (SPM), indicating that SPM had a greater number of species present and individuals distributed more equitably among these species, implying a stable site with many different niches. Diverse tree species in mixed-tree silvipastures created conditions for better regeneration and establishment of more ground vegetation. Low vegetation index values

**Table 1.** Vegetation Indices of herbs and shrubs in silvipasture systems and grasslands

Vegetation indices	Plant category	Systems (S)	E <sub>1</sub>	E <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>3</sub>	E <sub>4</sub>	E <sub>5</sub>	Vegetation indices
Shannon Weiner Index	Herbs	SPCP	2.09	2.58	2.57	2.47	2.59	2.88
		SPM	2.43	2.46	2.51	2.79	2.86	3.03
		SPBO			2.63	2.76	2.64	2.94
		Gr	1.83	1.51	2.37	2.45	2.60	2.53
	Shrubs	SPCP	2.01	2.69	2.51	2.75	2.74	2.97
		SPM	2.02	2.72	2.55	2.72	2.78	3.01
		SPBO	-	-	2.52	2.67	2.65	2.78
		Gr	1.91	2.36	2.50	2.54	2.63	2.88
Shannon Evenness Index	Herbs	SPCP	0.66	0.74	0.70	0.67	0.70	0.68
		SPM	0.70	0.74	0.66	0.80	0.79	0.71
		SPBO	-	-	0.69	0.77	0.71	0.71
		Gr	0.60	0.46	0.68	0.71	0.71	0.61
	Shrubs	SPCP	0.79	0.87	0.89	0.85	0.89	0.84
		SPM	0.84	0.89	0.92	0.88	0.89	0.85
		SPBO	-	-	0.91	0.86	0.89	0.83
		Gr	0.83	0.80	0.90	0.86	0.85	0.83

‘-’ = Not present; E<sub>1</sub> (<850 m), E<sub>2</sub> (851–1150 m), E<sub>3</sub> (1151–1450 m), E<sub>4</sub> (1451–1750 m) and E<sub>5</sub> (>1751 m); SPCP = Chir pine silvipasture, SPM = Mixed-trees silvipasture, SPBO = Ban oak silvipasture and Gr = Grassland

in grasslands suggest the presence of few potential niches where only a few species could establish and grow. Altitude is considered one of the most important determinants of vegetation distribution in mountain ecosystems due to its direct impact on the microclimate of the habitat. In the present investigation, the average value of different vegetation indices showed irregular patterns along elevational zones over the range of elevation covered in this study, which was contradictory with the results reported earlier. Many studies have shown a hump-shaped species distribution, reporting maximum species diversity near the middle of the elevational gradient (Kidane, 2019). In Western Himalayas, Dar and Sundarapandian (2016) reported maximum species diversity at middle elevations (2300–2800 m), while Zhang *et al.* (2013) reported a humped pattern (1500–1600 m) along elevational gradients in Baihua mountain reserve in China. However, Da Silva Mota *et al.* (2018) reported maximum species diversity at low elevations and the lowest at high elevations in Rupestrian grasslands in South-Eastern Brazil. The variation in species diversity with elevation might be due to the creation of varied climatic conditions along elevation (Rahbek, 2005; Fenetahun *et al.*, 2020) and soil differentiation (Korner, 2007; Bhutia *et al.*, 2021). These two together promoted the diversification of plant species (Wang *et al.*, 2007; Karami *et al.*, 2015; Lee and Chun, 2016).

**Phytosociology of vegetation:** The density of herbage in different Solan district land use systems ranged from 465.18 to 947.28 tillers  $m^{-2}$  (Table 2). The average density of herbage in SP differed significantly along the elevations ( $p < 0.001$ ). Maximum density as 715.14 tillers  $m^{-2}$  was recorded at  $E_1$  which decreased to 561.36 tillers  $m^{-2}$  at elevation  $E_5$ . Whereas in Gr the density of herbage differed significantly ( $p < 0.0001$ ) and followed the decreasing order as  $E_2 > E_3 > E_4 > E_5 > E_1$ . It was observed that the mean density of herbage was significantly ( $p < 0.0001$ ) high in Gr followed by SPCP, SPM and SPBO. The interaction of vegetation systems and elevation significantly affected herbage density ( $p < 0.0001$ ).

The basal area of herbage in different LUS of the district ranged from 21.38 to 58.04  $cm^2 m^{-2}$  (Table 3). A thorough examination of data indicates that mean basal area of herbage ( $cm^2 m^{-2}$ ) in silvipasture systems was significantly high as 51.70  $cm^2 m^{-2}$  at elevation  $E_1$  that gradually reduced to 28.77  $cm^2 m^{-2}$  at  $E_5$  ( $p < 0.0001$ ). Whereas in Gr, it was 58.04  $cm^2 m^{-2}$  at  $E_1$  that reduced along the elevations to 39.29  $cm^2 m^{-2}$  at  $E_5$  ( $p < 0.0001$ ). The mean basal area of herbage was significantly higher in Gr followed by SPCP, SPM and SPBO ( $p < 0.0001$ ). The interaction effect of vegetation systems and elevations on the basal area of herbage was significant ( $p < 0.0001$ ). In this study, it was observed that the density of chir pine silvipasture (SPCP), mixed-tree silvipasture (SPM), and ban oak silvipasture (SPBO) was reduced by 21.98, 25.79, and 42.88%, respectively as compared to grassland (Gr), while the basal area of herbage was reduced by 15.58, 19.35, and 51.74%, respectively, as compared to grasslands. The decrease in these phytosociological parameters of herbage in silvipastures as compared to grasslands might be due to shade effect of trees, enhanced inter-specific or intra-specific competition for resource utilization, site type and inhibition of seed germination on account of tree exudates (Anderson *et al.*, 1969; Gupta and Sharma, 2015). In addition, the amount of litter deposited on the soil surface might also contribute to the decline (Ellsworth *et al.*, 2004) which might be influenced by litter deposition and litter decomposition rate, the density of overstorey vegetation, site and environmental conditions. Further, a higher value of density and basal area of herbage in chir pine silvipasture as compared to other silvipastures could be ascribed to a sparse crown cover of dominant trees owing to its needle-shaped leaves accompanied by regular burning of litter before the commencement of rains by the local inhabitants creating optimal conditions for herbaceous growth. The low values of these parameters of herbage at higher elevations could be ascribed to adverse environmental variables like lower pressure of atmospheric gases which influence gas exchange (Terashima *et al.*, 1995), decrease in atmospheric temperature (Korner and Paulsen, 2004), increase in radiation (Korner *et al.*, 1983) and reduced

**Table 2.** Density (tillers/ $m^2$ ) of herbage in silvipasture systems and grasslands at different elevations

Systems (S)	Density of herbage at different elevations (E)					Mean (S)
	$E_1$	$E_2$	$E_3$	$E_4$	$E_5$	
SPCP	712.78	694.21	667.02	652.02	641.66	673.54 b
SPM	717.50	684.87	641.79	581.61	577.25	640.61 b
SPBO	-	-	537.22	476.88	465.18	493.10 c
Mean (E)	715.14 a	689.54 a	615.34 b	570.17b	561.36b	619.23
Gr	797.33 c	947.28 a	911.87 ab	840.69 bc	819.11 c	863.26a

'-' = Not present;  $E_1$  (<850 m),  $E_2$  (851–1150 m),  $E_3$  (1151–1450 m),  $E_4$  (1451–1750 m) and  $E_5$  (>1751 m); SPCP = Chir pine silvipasture, SPM = Mixed-trees silvipasture, SPBO = Ban oak silvipasture and Gr = Grassland; Different successive letters suffixing the numbers in the columns for 'Mean (S)' and rows for Mean (E), Gr' denote significant difference, SxE = Significant

**Table 3.** Basal area (cm<sup>2</sup>/m<sup>2</sup>) of herbage in silvipasture systems and grasslands at different elevations

Systems (S)	Basal area of herbage at different elevations (E)					Mean (S)
	E <sub>1</sub>	E <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>3</sub>	E <sub>4</sub>	E <sub>5</sub>	
SPCP	50.20	45.51	41.40	37.95	35.19	42.05 b
SPM	53.20	46.05	39.70	32.15	29.74	40.17 b
SPBO	-	-	27.02	23.73	21.38	24.04 c
Mean (E)	51.70 a	45.78 a	36.04 b	31.28 bc	28.77 c	37.17 b
Gr	58.04 a	54.93 ab	51.63b	45.18 c	39.29 d	49.81 a

'-' = Not present; E<sub>1</sub> (<850 m), E<sub>2</sub> (851-1150 m), E<sub>3</sub> (1151-1450 m), E<sub>4</sub> (1451-1750 m) and E<sub>5</sub> (>1751 m); SPCP = Chir pine silvipasture, SPM = Mixed-trees silvipasture, SPBO = Ban oak silvipasture and Gr = Grassland; Different successive letters suffixing the numbers in the columns for 'Mean (S)' and rows for Mean (E), 'Gr' denote significant difference, SxE = Significant

growing season (Wang *et al.*, 2007). Similarly, Gupta and Sharma (2015) and Yadav *et al.* (2020) found that the density and basal area of the herbage decreased with elevation in grasslands and tree-based systems in the Himalayas.

In the present study, IVI values of constituent species of the herbage revealed that only a few species displayed high values of IVI compared to all other species in different land-use systems with no particular trend along the elevation. The dominant species in the herbage community of SPCP was *Chrysopogon fulvus* (IVI = 58.16) and *Themeda anathera* (IVI = 50.73) was the co-dominant species. In SPM systems, *C. fulvus* (IVI = 46.65) and *Apluda mutica* (IVI value = 36.36) were dominant and co-dominant species, respectively. However, the dominant and

co-dominant species in SPBO were *T. anathera* (IVI = 52.73) and *A. mutica*. (IVI = 34.88) respectively and in Gr, the dominant species was *C. fulvus* (IVI = 79.29) and co-dominant species was *Heteropogon contortus* (IVI = 51.90) (Table 4).

Given the dominant and co-dominant species of different silvipastures and grasslands of the district, it was clearly observed that only a few grass species dominate these land-use systems. The common herbaceous species in silvipastures and grasslands were *A. mutica*, *Arundinella nepalensis*, *C. fulvus*, *H. contortus*, *Panicum maximum*, *Themeda anathera*. The presence of species in any area is determined by the prevailing environmental conditions and their tolerance and adaptation to it. These species exhibited wide ecological amplitude, confirming their

**Table 4.** Importance value index (IVI) of herbage species in silvipasture systems and grasslands

Species/categories	SPCP	SPM	SPBO	Gr
<b>Grasses</b>				
<i>A. mutica</i> Linn.	23.61	36.36	34.88	13.68
<i>Arundinella nepalensis</i> Trin.	17.36	23.37	20.39	12.60
<i>Avena fatua</i> Linn.	3.66	13.42	24.16	0.86
<i>Bothriochloa pertusa</i> (L.) A. Camus	-	-	8.26	-
<i>Brachiaria reptans</i> (L.) Gard. & C. E. Hubbard	0.54	1.45	-	-
<i>Capillipedium huegelii</i> (Hack.) A. Camus	4.44	1.44	2.04	4.03
<i>Chloris dolichostachya</i> Lag.	0.42	-	-	-
<i>Chloris gayana</i> Kunth	-	-	-	0.29
<i>Chrysopogon gryllus</i> (L.) Trin.	3.018	0.68	1.44	2.83
<i>Chrysopogon montanus</i> Trin.	58.16	46.65	12.99	79.29
<i>Cymbopogon martinii</i> (Roxb.) Wats.	2.63	1.52	-	5.15
<i>Dichanthium annulatum</i> (Forssk.) Stapf	2.57	1.16	0.72	1.34
<i>Digitaria stricta</i> Roth ex Roem. & Schult.	4.79	4.61	2.05	3.67
<i>Echinochloa colona</i> (Linn.) Link	0.17	2.79	-	0.28
<i>Eragrostis nigra</i> Nees ex Steud.	0.79	-	0.61	-
<i>Eulaliopsis binata</i> (Retz.) C.E. Hubb.	3.62	5.94	-	-

*Floristic composition and phytosociology of land use systems*

Species/categories	SPCP	SPM	SPBO	Gr
<b>Grasses</b>				
<i>Hemarthria protensa</i> Steud.	0.46	0.66	-	5.50
<i>Heteropogon contortus</i> (Linn.) P. Beauv.ex Roem. & Schult.	24.50	17.81	2.57	51.90
<i>Imperata cylindrica</i> (Linn.) P. Beauv.	8.68	4.85	1.04	3.94
<i>Panicum coloratum</i> Linn.	2.48	1.99	-	2.19
<i>Panicum maximum</i> Jacq.	7.49	3.80	7.78	15.94
<i>Panicum sanguinale</i> Linn.	1.05	4.73	-	5.30
<i>Paspalidium flavidum</i> (Retz.) A. Camus	-	0.64	-	-
<i>Paspalum notatum</i> Flugge	0.17	0.33	0.35	0.43
<i>Pennisetum flaccidum</i> Griseb.	0.796	1.84	2.79	1.71
<i>Pennisetum orientale</i> L. C. Rich.	3.67	1.92	0.23	4.44
<i>Setaria glauca</i> (Linn.) P. Beauv.	2.27	1.65	-	0.42
<i>Setaria verticillata</i> (Linn.) P. Beauv.	0.94	0.43	-	1.76
<i>Sorghum bicolor</i> (Linn.) Moench	-	1.44	-	0.68
<i>Themeda anathera</i> (Nees ex Steud.) Hack	50.73	26.72	52.73	22.20
<i>Urochloa panicoides</i> P. Beauv.	8.43	10.04	19.95	6.97
<i>Vetiveria zizanioides</i> (Linn.) Nash	0.70	-	1.13	-
<b>Sedges</b>				
<i>Carex cruciata</i> Wahlenb.	-	1.24	7.69	0.21
<i>Carex wallichiana</i> Spreng.	1.43	0.35	1.37	-
<i>Cyperus esculantus</i> Linn.	1.21	1.16	0.55	1.34
<i>Cyperus rotundus</i> Linn.	1.66	2.18	9.17	0.43
<i>Eriophorum comosum</i> (Wall.) Nees	2.69	2.93	-	1.77
<i>Fimbristylis pierotii</i> Miquel	3.11	2.92	2.32	4.20
<i>Fimbristylis rigidula</i> Nees	0.196	2.33	4.37	0.57
<b>Forbs</b>				
<i>Achyranthes aspera</i> Linn.	0.45	-	-	-
<i>Adiantum incisum</i> Forssk.	2.09	3.91	0.94	-
<i>Ageratum conyzoides</i> Linn.	4.62	6.36	1.48	2.03
<i>Anaphalis busua</i> (Buch.-Ham.) DC.	0.76	0.22	-	0.10
<i>Artemisia roxburghiana</i> Wall. Ex Besser	1.79	3.93	2.67	5.73
<i>Barleria strigosa</i> Willd.	-	-	-	0.71
<i>Bidens pilosa</i> Linn.	8.54	9.25	4.15	6.29
<i>Bidens tripartita</i> Linn.	0.89	2.18	2.92	0.96
<i>Bupleurum flacutum</i> Linn.	-	-	1.30	0.29
<i>Centella asiatica</i> (Linn.) Urban.	0.24	0.57	1.45	0.19
<i>Cheilathes farinosa</i> (Forssk.) Kaulf.	0.24	1.74	0.68	0.12
<i>Cissampelos pareira</i> Linn.	0.59	0.35	0.83	0.91
<i>Commelina benghalensis</i> Linn.	1.61	3.95	6.47	0.53
<i>Dicliptera bupleuroides</i> Nees	1.72	1.92	3.54	2.19

Species/categories	SPCP	SPM	SPBO	Gr
<b>Grasses</b>				
<i>Dioscorea esculenta</i> (Lour.) Burkill	0.25	0.25	1.28	-
<i>Erigeron annuus</i> (Linn.) Pers.	2.68	5.48	7.46	2.27
<i>Euphorbia heterophylla</i> Linn.	0.79	1.08	1.58	1.75
<i>Galinsoga parviflora</i> Cav.	-	-	0.59	0.1
<i>Galium aparine</i> Linn.	0.21	1.01	-	-
<i>Gerbera gossypina</i> (Royle) Beauv.	0.42	1.10	0.7	0.120
<i>Gnaphalium luteo-album</i> Linn.	0.11	0.33	1.26	0.60
<i>Justicia simplex</i> D. Don.	0.43	0.67	0.52	0.80
<i>Lamium album</i> Linn.	-	0.89	0.96	0.12
<i>Leucas lanata</i> Benth.	1.25	0.43	0.36	0.34
<i>Malaxis acuminata</i> D. Don	0.26	1.00	0.92	-
<i>Micromeria biflora</i> (Buch.-Ham. ex D. Don) Benth.	4.67	2.45	0.89	4.52
<i>Origanum vulgare</i> Linn.	1.75	2.26	6.08	0.94
<i>Pimpinella diversifolia</i> DC.	0.40	1.03	1.15	0.30
<i>Polygala persicariaefolia</i> sensu Eyles non DC.	0.11	-	0.26	0.24
<i>Reinwardtia indica</i> Dumort.	2.82	1.91	4.67	0.52
<i>Rumex nepalensis</i> Spreng.	-	0.29	5.98	-
<i>Scutellaria scandens</i> D. Don.	-	1.28	-	-
<i>Sonchus oleraceus</i> Linn.	2.36	1.54	1.96	0.39
<i>Teucrium quadrifarium</i> Buch.-Ham.	0.28	-	0.15	0.10
<i>Thalictrum foliosum</i> DC.	3.35	5.10	2.28	0.52
<i>Tricholepis elongata</i> DC.	0.50	-	0.24	1.94
<i>Viola serpens</i> Wall. Ex Ging.	-	2.22	0.47	0.17
<b>Herbaceous legumes</b>				
<i>Argyrobium flaccidum</i> (Royle) Jaub. & Spach	1.10	-	1.79	0.53
<i>Cassia absus</i> Linn.	0.87	0.58	2.59	1.67
<i>Cassia mimosoides</i> Linn.	0.98	1.00	1.82	2.13
<i>Desmodium laxiflorum</i> DC.	-	0.22	0.87	-
<i>Desmodium pulchellum</i> Backer	0.39	0.60	-	-
<i>Flemingia vestita</i> Benth. ex Baker.	0.31	0.73	3.65	-
<i>Lespedeza gerardiana</i> Maxim.	1.71	0.81	1.07	4.89
<i>Rhynchosia himalensis</i> Benth. Ex Baker	0.89	-	0.45	-

'-' = Not present; SPCP = Chir pine silvipasture, SPM = Mixed-trees silvipasture, SPBO = Ban oak silvipasture and Gr = Grassland

ability to survive successfully in subtropical through mesic to a temperate climate and revealing their long biotic range.

The total density of shrubs in different land-use systems of the district varied from 1516.67 to 3015.00 plants ha<sup>-1</sup> (Table 5). The density of shrubs (plants ha<sup>-1</sup>) in silvipasture systems changed significantly ( $p < 0.0001$ ) along the elevation. The maximum total density of shrubs was recorded at E<sub>2</sub> and lowest at E<sub>5</sub>. In Gr, the density of

shrubs decreased significantly along elevation with maximum value at E<sub>1</sub> and minimum at E<sub>5</sub>. The mean density of shrubs was significantly high in SPM (2673.11 plants ha<sup>-1</sup>) as compared to SPBO (2277.78 plants ha<sup>-1</sup>), SPCP (2129.00 plants ha<sup>-1</sup>) and Gr (1973.41 plants ha<sup>-1</sup>) ( $p < 0.0001$ ). The interaction effect of vegetation systems and elevations on the density of shrubs was insignificant. The total basal area of shrubs in different land use systems of the district varied from 0.32 m<sup>2</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup> in SPBO

**Table 5.** Density (plants ha<sup>-1</sup>) of shrubs in silvipasture systems and grasslands at different elevations

Systems (S)	Density of shrubs at different elevations (E)					Mean (S)
	E <sub>1</sub>	E <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>3</sub>	E <sub>4</sub>	E <sub>5</sub>	
SPCP	2316.67	2583.33	2238.89	1880.00	1626.11	2129.00 b
SPM	2933.33	3015.00	2726.11	2580.00	2111.11	2673.11 a
SPBO	-	-	2633.33	2255.56	1944.44	2277.78 b
Mean (E)	2625.00 a	2799.17 a	2532.78 ab	2238.52 b	1893.89 c	2372.61
Gr	2411.11 a	2172.11 ab	2027.78abc	1739.39 bc	1516.67c	1973.41 b

'-' = Not present; E<sub>1</sub> (< 850 m), E<sub>2</sub> (851–1150 m), E<sub>3</sub> (1151–1450 m), E<sub>4</sub> (1451–1750 m) and E<sub>5</sub> (> 1751 m); SPCP = Chir pine silvipasture, SPM = Mixed-trees silvipasture, SPBO = Ban oak silvipasture and Gr = Grassland; Different successive letters suffixing the numbers in the columns for 'Mean (S)' and rows for Mean (E), Gr' denote significant difference, SxE = Non-significant

**Table 6.** Basal area (m<sup>2</sup>/ha) of shrubs in silvipasture systems and grasslands at different elevations

Systems (S)	Basal area of shrubs at different elevations (E)					Mean (S)
	E <sub>1</sub>	E <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>3</sub>	E <sub>4</sub>	E <sub>5</sub>	
SPCP	0.48	0.55	0.46	0.40	0.34	0.44 a
SPM	0.53	0.58	0.50	0.45	0.39	0.49 a
SPBO	-	-	0.45	0.37	0.32	0.38 b
Mean (E)	0.50 ab	0.57 a	0.47 b	0.41 c	0.35 d	0.45
Gr	0.51 a	0.47 ab	0.44 ab	0.42 bc	0.37 c	0.44a

'-' = Not present; E<sub>1</sub> (< 850 m), E<sub>2</sub> (851–1150 m), E<sub>3</sub> (1151–1450 m), E<sub>4</sub> (1451–1750 m) and E<sub>5</sub> (> 1751 m); SPCP = Chir pine silvipasture, SPM = Mixed-trees silvipasture, SPBO = Ban oak silvipasture and Gr = Grassland; Different successive letters suffixing the numbers in the columns for 'Mean (S)' and rows for Mean (E), Gr' denote significant difference, SxE = Non-significant

at E<sub>5</sub> to 0.58 m<sup>2</sup>ha<sup>-1</sup> in SPM at E<sub>2</sub> (Table 6). In silvipasture systems mean basal area of shrubs differed significantly ( $p < 0.0001$ ) among different elevations. The mean basal area of shrubs in silvipasture systems decreased in order: E<sub>2</sub> > E<sub>1</sub> > E<sub>3</sub> > E<sub>4</sub> > E<sub>5</sub>. Likewise, in Gr it significantly decreased ( $p < 0.0001$ ) with an increase in elevation. SPM produced the highest mean basal area of shrubs followed by SPCP, Gr and SPBO ( $p = 0.0001$ ). The interaction effect of vegetation systems and elevations on basal area of shrubs was insignificant. However, the highest basal area of shrubs of soil was recorded in SPM at E<sub>2</sub> and lowest in SPBO at E<sub>5</sub> ( $p = 0.2635$ ).

Comparing density and basal area of shrubs in individual silvipasture with grasslands, it was recorded that density of shrubs increased by 7.31, 26.18 and 13.36% in chir pine silvipasture, mixed-trees silvipasture and ban oak silvipasture, respectively as compared to grassland while, basal area of shrubs in chir pine silvipasture was almost equal to their basal area in grassland but, increased by 10.20% in mixed-trees silvipasture and decreased by 13.64% in ban oak silvipasture as compared to basal area of shrubs in grasslands. These results suggested that changes in microclimate conditions under tree-based systems like soil moisture, organic matter, light conditions, soil composition, pH and drainage patterns etc. favoured shrub growth. The differences in shrub population and their growth among silvipastures resulted from differences in microclimatic parameters described above

and the shade effect. The higher population of shrubs in SPM and SPBO indicated that shade-tolerant shrubs were dominant in ground vegetation. The dominance of shade-tolerant shrubs in vegetation was reported earlier by Ou *et al.* (2011). Anthropogenic activities in silvipastures could not be denied for such differences. These silvipastures are important fodder resources for rearing domestic animals and people often destroy unwanted species, thereby the open spaces were available for shrubs appearance. Furthermore, chir pine silvipasture are regularly burnt to enhance fodder availability which might have encouraged shrub diversity.

Analysis of the IVI value of shrub species (Table 7) revealed that *Lantana camara* (IVI = 31.07) was a dominant species and *Woodfordia fruticosa* (IVI = 27.93) and *Berberis lyceum* (IVI = 27.75) were considered as co-dominant species in SPCP. In SPM, shrub species like *W. fruticosa* (IVI = 33.08) and *L. camara* (IVI = 29.54) were dominant and co-dominant species, respectively. *Berberis lycium* (IVI = 55.26) and *Rubus ellipticus* (IVI = 38.70) were dominant and co-dominant species, respectively in SPBO and in Gr, the dominant and co-dominant species were *Carissa carandas* (IVI = 34.35) and *W. fruticosa* (IVI = 28.74).

Constituent shrubs' importance value index (IVI) varied with elevation in all land use systems barring ban oak silvipasture (SPBO). *W. fruticosa*, *L. camara*, *C. carandas*, *R. ellipticus*, *B. lycium*, *M. africana* and *M. koenigii* species of shrubs maintained higher IVI in all the communities.



**Table 7.** Importance value index (IVI) of shrub species in silvipasture systems and grasslands

Species/categories	SPCP	SPM	SPBO	Gr
<i>Adhatoda vasica</i> (Linn.) Nees	7.08	6.94	-	9.66
<i>Aechmanthera gossypina</i> (Nees) Nees	0.29	-	0.56	-
<i>Asparagus adscendens</i> Roxb.	5.49	6.96	5.43	5.85
<i>B. lycium</i> Royle	27.75	28.57	55.26	24.98
<i>Buddleja paniculata</i> Wall.	7.74	5.11	-	8.37
<i>Carissa carandas</i> Linn.	26.51	21.10	5.69	34.35
<i>Caryopteris wallichiana</i> Schauer	0.44	1.02	-	-
<i>Colebrookea oppositifolia</i> Smith	0.82	0.54	-	0.22
<i>Dodonaea viscosa</i> (L.) Jacq.	2.65	2.72	-	4.37
<i>Elaeagnus umbellata</i> Thunb.	-	-	2.97	-
<i>Hamiltonia suaveolens</i> (Roxb.) Roxb.	13.13	13.38	2.02	13.59
<i>Hypericum oblongifolium</i> Choisy	0.40	1.09	2.84	1.01
<i>Indigofera pulchella</i> Roxb.	13.03	9.90	13.69	20.47
<i>Inula cappa</i> (Buch.-Ham. ex D.Don) DC.	0.31	0.50	0.74	-
<i>Inula cuspidata</i> (Wall. ex DC.) C.B. Clarke	1.97	0.80	-	1.60
<i>Jasminum humile</i> Linn.	1.81	2.91	2.76	0.47
<i>Jasminum pubescens</i> (Retz.) Willd.	1.42	0.86	-	0.44
<i>L. camara</i> Linn.	31.07	29.54	2.19	25.94
<i>Leptodermis lanceolata</i> Wall.	6.97	7.23	15.53	4.72
<i>Leptopus cordifolius</i> Decne.	0.33	1.43	1.41	0.48
<i>Lespedeza stenocarpa</i> (Klotzsch) Maxim.	1.95	0.98	-	1.86
<i>Meriandra strobilifera</i> Benth.	4.21	3.19	-	3.49
<i>Mimosa rubicaulis</i> Lamarck	6.99	6.45	1.37	6.51
<i>Murraya koenigii</i> (L.) Spreng.	24.54	21.08	-	27.12
<i>Myrsine africana</i> Linn.	26.41	24.87	28.49	23.60
<i>Osyris arborea</i> Wall. ex A. DC.	3.60	3.38	2.48	5.37
<i>Plectranthus rugosus</i> Wall. ex Benth	5.64	5.06	7.23	5.69
<i>Prinsepia utilis</i> Royle	4.80	4.98	14.89	3.67
<i>Randia tetrasperma</i> (Wall. ex Roxb.) Benth. & Hook.f. ex Brandis	5.78	10.06	29.19	3.88
<i>Rhamnus virgatus</i> Roxb.	1.39	0.84	2.76	1.33
<i>Rosa brunonii</i> Lindl.	5.58	6.89	12.07	8.37
<i>R. ellipticus</i> Smith	24.16	27.12	38.70	19.20
<i>Rubus niveus</i> Thunb.	2.24	4.32	14.32	1.05
<i>Salvia coccinea</i> Juss. ex Murray	3.19	2.86	1.75	1.72
<i>Sarcococca saligna</i> (D.Don) Muell.-Arg.	-	-	4.16	-
<i>Strobilanthes atropurpureus</i> Nees.	-	1.81	20.70	-
<i>W. fruticosa</i> (Linn) Kurtz	27.93	33.08	5.96	28.74
<i>Zanthoxylum armatum</i> DC.	2.35	2.47	4.85	1.88

'-' = Not present; SPCP = Chir pine silvipasture, SPM = Mixed-trees silvipasture, SPBO = Ban oak silvipasture and Gr = Grassland

Higher IVI of these species was an indicator of their better growth in prevailing environment due to their harmonious ecological adaptation, good power of regeneration and greater ecological amplitude in comparison to other species. The dominance of *L. camara*, an invasive exotic species in the lower to mid-elevations indicated that the open ecosystem of these forage-based land-use systems along with the suitable climatic conditions of the region provides ideal conditions for the regeneration and establishment of this species, which may be a major threat to biodiversity and productivity of these land-use systems soon.

## Conclusion

The floral spectrum in various silvipasture systems and grasslands of Solan district, Himachal Pradesh, was broad. Silvipasture systems had more diversity of herbs and shrub species than grasslands, suggesting a stable site conducive to regeneration and establishing more ground vegetation species. However, phytosociological parameters like density and basal area of herbaceous vegetation were better in grasslands than in silvipasture systems, revealing the adverse effect of trees on the growth of herbage. Among silvipastures, the growth of herbage was most affected in ban oak silvipastures. Shrubs showed better growth parameters under silvipasture systems than grasslands. However, these parameters of vegetation decreased along the elevation.

## Acknowledgment

The authors are thankful to the Director of Research, Dr. YSP University of Horticulture and Forestry, Solan, Department of Science and Technology, New Delhi and Director, ICAR-IISWC, Dehradun for providing necessary support. The authors also acknowledge the support from villagers and forest officers of concerned sites in conducting the study.

## References

- Adhikari, B. S., M. Joshi, H. C. Rikhari and Y. S. Rawat. 1992. Cluster analysis (dendrogram) of high altitude (2150-2500 m) forest vegetation around Pindari glacier in Kumaun Himalaya. *Journal of Environmental Biology* 13: 101-105.
- Anderson, R. C., O. L. Loucks and A. M. Swain. 1969. Herbaceous response to canopy cover, light intensity and throughfall precipitation in coniferous forests. *Ecology* 50: 255-263.
- Bhutia, P. L., B. Gupta, R. P. Yadav, A. K. Gupta, K. G. Bhutia and P. Rai. 2021. Soil physico-chemical and biological properties as affected by vegetation systems and elevation in western Himalayas. *Range Management and Agroforestry* 42: 86-94.
- Boscutti, F., V. Casolo, P. Beraldo, E. Braidot, M. Zancani and C. Rixen. 2018. Shrub growth and plant diversity along an elevation gradient: Evidence of indirect effects of climate on alpine ecosystems. *PLoS ONE* 13: e0196653.
- Currie, D. J. and A. P. Francis. 2004. Regional versus climate effect on taxon richness in angiosperms: Reply to Qian and Ricklefs. *The American Naturalist* 163: 780-785.
- Da Silva Mota, G., G. R. Da Luz, N. M. Mota, C. E. Silva, M. Das Dores Magalhaes ~ Veloso, G. W. Fernandes and Y. R. F. Nunes. 2018. Changes in species composition, vegetation structure, and life forms along an altitudinal gradient of rupestrian grasslands in south-eastern Brazil. *Flora* 238: 32-42.
- Dar, J. A. and S. Sundarapandian. 2016. Patterns of plant diversity in seven temperate forest types of Western Himalaya, India. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Biodiversity* 9: 280-292.
- Ellsworth, J. W., R. A. Harrington and J.H. Fownes. 2004. Seedling emergence, growth, and allocation of Oriental bittersweet: effects of seed input, seed bank, and forest floor litter. *Forest Ecology and Management* 190: 255-264.
- Fenetahun, Y., W. Yong-dong and X.U. Xinwen. 2020. Assessment of impact of ecological elevation on grass species' diversity in Yabello Rangeland, southern Ethiopia. *International Journal of Biodiversity and Conservation* 12: 118-127.
- Gupta, B. and N. Sharma. 2015. Plant assemblages along an altitudinal gradient in Northwest Himalaya. *Journal of Forest and Environmental Science* 3: 91-108.
- Gupta, B., S. Sarvade and A. Mahmoud. 2015. Effects of selective tree species on phytosociology and production of understorey vegetation in mid-Himalayan region of Himachal Pradesh. *Range Management and Agroforestry* 36: 156-163.
- Hailu, H. 2017. Analysis of vegetation phytosociological characteristics and soil physico-chemical conditions in Harishin Rangelands of Eastern Ethiopia. *Land* 6: 1-17.
- Hussain, M., S.N. Geelani, A.H. Mughal, Akhlaq A. Wani and G.M. Bhat. 2019. Floristic composition of alpine grassland in Gulmarg, Kashmir. *Range Management and Agroforestry* 40: 188-195.
- Karami, R., H.R. Mehrabi and A. Ariapoor. 2015. The effect of altitude and slope in the species diversity of herbaceous plants (Case study: Watershed Miandar Qarootag - Gilangharb). *Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences* 5: 197-204.
- Kidane, Y.O., M.J. Steinbauer and M. Beierkuhnlein. 2019. Dead end for endemic plant species? A biodiversity hotspot under pressure. *Global Ecology and Conservation* 19: e00670.
- Körner, C. 2007. The use of altitude in ecological research. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 22: 569-574.
- Korner, C. and J. Paulsen. 2004. A world-wide study of high altitude treeline temperatures. *Journal of Biogeography* 31: 713-732.
- Korner, C., A. Allison and H. Hilscher. 1983. Altitudinal variation in leaf diffusive conductance and leaf anatomy in heliophytes of montane New Guinea and their interrelation with microclimate. *Flora* 174: 91-135.
- Kunwar, R. M., M. Fadiman, T. Hindle, M. K. Suwal, Y. P. Adhikari, K. Baral and R. Bussmann. 2019. Composition of forests and vegetation in the Kailash Sacred Landscape, Nepal. *Journey of Forestry Research* 31: 1625-1635.

- Lee, C. B. and J. H. Chun. 2016. Environmental drivers of patterns of plant diversity along a wide environmental gradient in Korean temperate forests. *Forests* 7: 19. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f7010019>.
- Mishra, R.. 1969. Ecology work book. Oxford and IBH Publications, New Delhi, India.
- Ou, Y., Z. Y. Su, Z. K. Li and Y. H. Lin. 2011. Effects of topographic factors on the distribution patterns of ground plants with different growth forms in montane forests in north Guangdong, China. *Chinese Journal of Applied Ecology* 22: 1107-1113.
- Ram, S. N., Kamini and M. S. Sannagoudar. 2023. Forage productivity and carbon storage from *Hardwickia binata* based silvopasture systems in semi-arid rainfed conditions. *Range Management and Agroforestry* 44: 233-240.
- Srivastav, M., A. Kumar and T. Hussain. 2015. Diversity of angiospermic plants in Dhanauli region Uttarakhand: an emerging tourist destination in western Himalaya. *Check List* 11: 1702. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15560/11.4.1702>.
- Terashima, I., T. Masuzawa, H. Ohba and Y. Yokoi. 1995. Is photosynthesis suppressed at higher elevations due to low CO<sub>2</sub> pressure? *Ecology* 76: 2663-2668.
- Wang, C. T., R. J. Long, Q. J. Wang, L. M. Ding and M. P. Wang. 2007. Effects of altitude on plant-species diversity and productivity in an alpine meadow, Qinghai-Tibetan plateau. *Australian Journal of Botany* 55: 110-117.
- Yadav, R. P., B. Gupta, V. S. Meena, M. Choudhary, M. Parihar, N. Shyam and J. K. Bisht. 2020. Effect of elevation and land use systems on phytosociology of shrub and herbage vegetation in Indian central Himalayas. In: A.T. Popova (ed). *Cutting-edge Research in Agricultural Sciences*, Vol. 4. Book Publisher International, West Bengal, India. pp. 100-108.
- Zhang, J.T., B. Xu and M. Li. 2013. Vegetation patterns and species diversity along elevational and disturbance gradients in the Baihua mountain reserve, Beijing, China. *Mountain Research and Development* 33: 170-178.