FUZZY DIAGNOSTICS OF SOILS ACCORDING TO THE WORLD REFERENCE BASE FOR SOIL RESOURCES

Abstract. Soil classification remains one of the most controversial topics in the world soil science because of differences in the principles underlying it. As of today, many countries have developed and use their own national classifications. Since scientific classification facilitates successful investigation and proper use of soils, the issue arises of representation of one classification in another. In the paper the possibility of applying fuzzy technologies to soil diagnostics based on the World Reference Base for Soil Resources is considered. A trapezoidal form of membership functions of the parameter set of diagnostic horizons is proposed. The algorithm of fuzzy diagnostics is presented on the basis of the proposed functions.

Conclusion. The paper proposes a fuzzification mechanism for the set of indicators of diagnostic parameters and describes the algorithm of the system of fuzzy inference about the identification of the values of the corresponding parameters in accordance with the compositional inference rule. Thus, the effectiveness of the use of fuzzy technologies in soil diagnostics by the World Reference Base for Soil Resources is demonstrated.
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Introduction

Such classifications include, for instance, the soil classification of Australia (Australian Soil Classification, 2002) [1], Azerbaijan (M.P. Babayev’s classification, 2006), Belarus (Belarusian soil classification, 1997) [2], Brazil (Sistema Brasileiro de Classificacao de Solos, 1999) [3, p.1-3], Germany (Harmonization of Soil Survey Classification-Blending of East and West, 1990), Canada (Canadian System of Soil Classification, 1995) [4], Russia (V.V. Dokuchaevev’s classification, 1977) [5], USA (Keys to Soil Taxonomy, 2003) [6], France (Referentael Pedologique, 2008) [7, p.166] etc. The foundation of the work on the creation of an international soil classification was laid back in the 1970s by Professor R. Dudal [8]. Afterwards, a consolidated program was developed, which was later named “World Reference Base for Soil Resources” (WRB) [9]. The main objective of WRB was the introduction of the latest achievements in soil science related to the study of global soil resources and their interrelationships.

Since scientific classification facilitates successful investigation and proper use of soils, the issue arises of representation of one classification in another. The process of determining whether a soil belongs to a particular class of soils in the classification in question is called soil diagnostics. Each of these classifications has its own diagnostic algorithm. There is a certain number of soil parameters, by which a soil is placed in one class or another. However, the measurement range of these parameters is often approximate, fuzzy. In view of the above, this paper is devoted to the study of the possibility of applying fuzzy technologies to soil diagnostics based on the World Reference Base for Soil Resources.

On the priority of the defining classification factor

It should be noted that, depending on the structural principle, different classifications use different parameters and use them in different sequences. In soil classification, different soil science schools prioritize different criteria based on the objective at hand. Here is an example showing the importance of the sequence of classification criteria applied.

We shall consider three notional tomato cultivars. Let each cultivar be characterized by three parameters: yield, disease resistance and water requirement. Assume that the first cultivar has a high yield, but is not resistant to diseases and requires abundant watering (Table 1). The second cultivar is resistant to diseases and has a high water requirement but an average yield. And the third cultivar is not disease-resistant, has an average yield but a low water requirement.

Table 1 – Values of the indicators for different tomato cultivars in conventional units

| Indicator          | Cultivar |
|--------------------|----------|
|                    | I        | II       | III      |
| Yield              | 1.0      | 0.8      | 0.6      |
| Disease resistance | 0.8      | 0.1      | 1.0      |
| Water requirement  | 0.7      | 0.5      | 1.0      |

Assume that, for the purpose of cultivation, three farmers need to classify these tomato cultivars into three categories, “Preferred”, “Allowed”, “Undesirable”. It is known that the first farmer grows tomatoes in a greenhouse, where all the conditions required for the optimal development of plants can be created; the second farmer works in an arid zone with limited irrigation water, and the third one – in the ecological area, where the use of chemicals is not allowed.

It is obvious that the first farmer prioritizes the criterion of yield, the second farmer proceeds from cultivation in the conditions of limited water resources, and the third farmer prioritizes the resistance of the cultivar to diseases. Consequently, the preferences of these farmers will be as specified in Table 2. This example demonstrates that changing the sequence of the applied classification criteria can lead to completely different results.
Fuzzy nature of diagnostic parameters

The defining factors in the soil diagnostics are genetic horizons. There are 37 of them in the WRB system. Each of these horizons is estimated on the basis of the values of specific sets of parameters. Table 3 gives examples of genetic horizons [9].

Table 3 – Some genetic horizon according to the WRB classification

| Genetic horizon          | Parameters                                                                 |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Protovertic horizon      | • Clay;                                                                    |
|                          | • Wedge-shaped soil aggregates;                                           |
|                          | • Shrink-swell cracks;                                                    |
|                          | • Coefficient of linear extensibility;                                    |
|                          | • Thickness.                                                              |
| Salic horizon            | • pH water;                                                                |
|                          | • Soluble salts;                                                          |
|                          | • Thickness;                                                              |
|                          | • Consist of organic or mineral material.                                 |
| Petrogypsic horizon      | • Secondary gypsum (CaSO4·2H2O);                                          |
|                          | • Gypsum (by mass);                                                      |
|                          | • Thickness.                                                              |
| Fragic horizon           | • Consists of mineral material;                                           |
|                          | • Soil organic carbon;                                                    |
|                          | • Penetration resistance at field capacity;                               |
|                          | • Effervescence.                                                          |

At present, the WRB classification includes 32 reference soil groups. However, when assigning a soil to a reference soil group, not all parameters are used.

Depending on the reference soil group, the parameters under consideration also change. Let us illustrate this with the following example. Take two reference soil groups, Fluvisol and Histosol. When assigning a soil to Histosol, the thickness of the horizon of organic materials is considered first, and in Fluvisol, it is the presence of alluvial material in the soil profile that is primarily taken into account.

The total number of parameters that characterize a soil is 28, and most of them have a fuzzy range of measurement.

We give some of these parameters as an example below in Table 4.

It should also be noted that the values of these parameters are measured with a certain error; therefore, their mean values are used in soil diagnostics.

Thus, sets of indicators can be determined as corresponding elements of fuzzy sets [10].

In the following paragraphs, we shall perform the fuzzification of a set of indicators of diagnostic parameters, applying the fuzzy technology to the description of the data, after which we shall use fuzzy inference rules to carry out clustering of soils according to the WRB system.

Description of the parameters as fuzzy numbers

As a rule, when choosing the membership function type, preference is given to the forms that are easier to compute. To describe the membership function of a set of diagnostic parameters of soil, we shall use a trapezoidal function. This choice is based on the following reasoning: the numerical values of the parameters under consideration vary within certain intervals; accuracy of measurement of point values has errors; the boundaries of the intervals of values are points.

Using the parameter of soil pH (acidity) as an example (Table 4), we analytically build a trapezoidal membership function.

To this end, we number the values of the soil pH parameter \( i = 1, \ldots, 11 \). Let \( a_i \) be the sequence of the upper limit values of these parameters, and \( a_0 = 0 \) – the
lower limit value "Ultra acidic". We call the interval 
\[ [a_i, a_{i+1}] \] the original carrier of the \( i \)-th value of the parameter in question. For the value with the serial numbers \( i = 2,3,\ldots,10 \), we shall propose the membership function of the following form:

\[
\mu(x,i) = \begin{cases} 
0, & x \leq \frac{a_{i-1} + 19a_i}{20}, \\
\frac{a_{i+1} - a_i}{20} + \frac{20x - (19a_i + a_{i+1})}{20}, & \frac{a_{i-1} + 19a_i}{20} \leq x \leq \frac{a_{i+1} + a_{i+2}}{20}, \\
\frac{a_{i+1} + a_{i+2}}{20}, & \frac{a_{i+1} + a_{i+2}}{20} \leq x \leq a_i + 19a_{i+1}, \\
\frac{19a_i + a_{i+1}}{20}, & a_i + 19a_{i+1} \leq x \leq x \leq a_{i+1} + a_{i+2}, \\
\frac{a_{i+2} - a_i}{20} + \frac{20x - (19a_{i+1} + a_{i+2})}{20}, & a_{i+2} - a_i \leq x \leq a_{i+1} + a_{i+2}, \\
0, & 0 \leq x \leq 20 (20 - 954.4)/1.2, \\
20 (20 - 89)/1.5, & 4.355 \leq x \leq 4.43, \\
(20x - 954.4)/1.2, & 4.97 \leq x \leq 5.03, \\
0, & 5.03 \leq x.
\end{cases}
\] (1)

Formally assuming e.g. \( a_{-1} = -1 \), \( a_{12} = 15 \), we can also extend formula (1) to the values \( i = 1 \) and \( i = 11 \).

As an example, let us give the value "Very strongly acidic" for the soil pH parameter:

\[
\mu_{pH}(x,3) = \begin{cases} 
0, & 0 \leq x \leq 4.355, \\
(20x - 89)/1.5, & 4.355 \leq x \leq 4.43, \\
1, & 4.43 \leq x \leq 4.97, \\
(20x - 954.4)/1.2, & 4.97 \leq x \leq 5.03, \\
0, & 5.03 \leq x.
\end{cases}
\]

For clarity, the graph of the function \( \mu_{pH}(x,3) \) is given in Fig. 1.

![Fig. 1. Graph of the membership function for the value "Very strongly acidic" of the soil pH parameter](image)

It should be noted that the functions \( \mu(x,i) \) are not symmetric functions, i.e. their graphs are not isosceles trapezoids. It is not too difficult to see that the function \( \mu(x,i) = 1 \) is within 90% of the original carrier of the values of the parameter in question and covers 5% of the original carriers of adjacent values of the same parameter (Fig. 2).

The overlapping of the intervals of the supports of the constructed functions \( \mu(x,i) \) provides an explanation to the disputes related to soil clustering in various soil science schools.

In the following paragraphs, we demonstrate that in the case of coincidence of the values of the membership function with the adjacent values, the soil classification algorithm chooses a value with a smaller serial number, thereby introducing a certain clarity in the process of clustering.

**Description of the soil classification algorithm**

During soil diagnostics, soil is studied first: the soil is sectioned, the soil parameters are measured (some parameters are determined in the field and some in the laboratory).

To identify the diagnostic horizons, the soil parameters are compared with the parameters of the horizons, using the compositional inference rule. Thus, it is established which horizons exist in the given soil. This operation is additive and does not depend on the sequence of application of the values of some or other parameter.

Further, proceeding from the available diagnostic horizons in the soil under investigation, it is possible to identify to which of the 32 reference soil groups it belongs. For this purpose, the main diagnostic indicators of the soil are successively checked in accordance with Table 5.

**Table 5 – Sequence of genetic horizons for soil identification according to the WRB classification**

| #    | Genetic horizon | Parameters                                                                 |
|------|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1    | Anthraquic      | Munsell colours; Platy structure; Bulk density; Thickness of soil.         |
| 2    | Argic horizon   | Illuvial accumulation of clay; Predominant pedogenetic formation of clay in the subsoil; Selective surface erosion of clay; Biological activity; Coefficient of linear extensibility; Has a texture class of loamy sand or finer; |
Further, comparing the diagnostic indicators of soils with the obtained diagnostic horizons (in the strict sequence of the given algorithm), the first reference soil group on the list is found.

**Example**

Let us give an example by considering sierozem soils. The monograph by M. P. Babayev [11] defines the indicators of these soils as follows:

- soil with anthropogenically transformed horizon thicker than 50 cm, root penetration depth 20-30 cm;
- no horizon over 40 cm, by two thirds consisting of weakly decomposed organic residues;
- no technogenic inclusions;
- no cryic horizon;
- thin section in sierozem soil over 30 cm;
- 42% clay in the 25-30 cm thick horizon in sierozem soil.

The membership function for such indicators as "soil thickness", "organic residues", "root penetration depth", "technogenic inclusions", "thickess of the cryic horizon", "thickness of thin section", "thickness of the argic horizon".

The results of the fuzzy inference about the identification of the parameter values are given below in Table 6.

| Sequence of reference soil groups | Diagnostic indicators of soils | Result |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|
| Histosols                        | Thickness of the horizon;      | No     |
|                                  | Organic residues               |        |
| Anthrosols                       | Depth of penetration of the    | No     |
|                                  | root mass in the anthropogenically transformed horizon | |
| Technosols                       | The presence of technogenic    | No     |
|                                  | inclusions in the upper layer  |        |
| Cryosols                         | There is a frozen horizon      | No     |
| Leptosols                        | Thickness of thin profile      | No     |
| Vertisols                        | Presence of clay in the Vertic horizon with a thickness of clay horizon. | Yes |

Thus, the soil under investigation, according to the granulometric composition data for sierozem soils based on M. Babayev’s classification of Azerbaijan soils, can be assigned to the soil group "Vertisols".

**Conclusion**

The paper proposes a fuzzification mechanism for the set of indicators of diagnostic parameters and describes the algorithm of the system of fuzzy inference about the identification of the values of the corresponding parameters in accordance with the compositional inference rule. Thus, the effectiveness of the use of fuzzy technologies in soil diagnostics by the World Reference Base for Soil Resources is demonstrated.
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Нечетка діагностика грунтів
Відповідно до Світової реферативної бази грунтових ресурсів
С. А. Хасанова, А. Б. Пашаев, Е. Н. Сабзіев

Анотація. Класифікація грунтів залишається однією з найбільш суперечливих тем в світовій науці про грунти через відмінності в основоположних принципах. На сьогоднішній день багато країн розробили і використовують свої власні національні класифікації. Оскільки наукова класифікація полегшує успішне дослідження і правильне використання грунтів, виникає проблема представления однієї класифікації в інший. У статті розглядається можливість застосування нечітких технологій для діагностики грунтів на основі всесвітньої довідкової бази грунтових ресурсів. Розроблено нечіткі виведення про ідентифікацію значень відповідних параметрів відповідно до правила композиційного виведення. Таким чином, доведена ефективність використання нечітких технологій в діагностиці грунтів Світової реферативної базою грунтових ресурсів.

Ключові слова: інформаційна модель; грунт; нечіткі технології; класифікація грунтів; діагностичний горизонт; діагностичні параметри.

Нечетка діагностика почв
в соответствии з Міровою реферативною базою почвенных ресурсов
С. А. Хасанова, А. Б. Пашаев, Э. Н. Сабзев

Анотация. Классификация почв остается одной из самых противоречивых тем в мировой науке о почве из-за различий в основополагающих принципах. На сегодняшний день многие страны разработали и используют свои национальные классификации. Поскольку научная классификация облегчает успешное исследование и правильное использование почв, виникает проблема представления одной классификации в другую. В статье рассматривается возможность применения нечетких технологий для диагностики почв на основе Всемирной Справочной Базы почвенных ресурсов. Предложена трапецеидальная форма функции принадлежности набора параметров диагностических горизонтов. Алгоритм нечеткой диагностики представлен на основе предложенных функций. Вывод. В статье предложен механизм фазификации для набора индикаторов диагностических параметров и описан алгоритм системы нечеткого вывода об идентификации значений соответствующих параметров в соответствии с правилом композиционного вывода. Таким образом, доказана эффективность использования нечетких технологий в диагностике почвы Мировой реферативной базой почвенных ресурсов.

Ключевые слова: информационная модель; почва; нечеткие технологии; классификация почв; диагностический горизонт; диагностические параметры.