

## Supplementary Material

**Tab. S1** - Parameters of Quality indices: CQI, SQI, VQI, MQI and SoQI– classes, corresponding weights, and data sources.

Indices	Parameter	Classes	Description	Score	Data Source	
Climate quality index <b>CQI</b>	<b>Aridity Index AI (mm/mm)</b> (UNEP FAO 1992) (Viera et al. 2015)	1	Humid (> 0.65)	1.0	Republic Hydrometeorological Service of Serbia (RH MOS)	
		2	Dry sub—humid (0.51—0.65)	1.5		
		3	Semi—arid (< 0.50)	2.0		
	<b>Rainfall (VII) (mm)</b> (Kosmas et al. 2014)	1	> 1000	1.0		
		2	650–1000	1.3		
		3	280–650	1.6		
		4	< 280	2.0		
	<b>Rainfall erosivity</b> (De Pina Tavares et al. 2015)	1	< 60	1.0		
		2	60–90	1.5		
		3	91–120	1.7		
		4	121–160	1.8		
		5	> 160	2.0		
	<b>Aspect</b> (Kosmas et al. 2014)	1	N, NE, NW, E, W, flat	1.0		Digital Elevation Model (DEM)
		2	S, SE, SW	2.0		
	Soil Quality Index <b>SQI</b>	<b>Parent material</b> (De Pina Tavares et al. 2015; Vieira et al. 2015)	1	diorite, syenite		1.05
2			trachyte, quartzlatite	1.10		
3			gneiss, mica shist, leptinolite	1.35		
4			Schists, phyllite, slate rock, amphibolite shales, meta-sandstones	1.50		
5			Marble, agglomerate, tuff, pyroclastic breccia, sandstone, conglomerates, claystone	1.75		
6			Unconsolidated sediments (colluvial and alluvial deposits, sandy deposits etc.)	2.00		

Lukic S, Baumgertel A, Obradovic S, Kadovic R, Beloica J, Pantic D, Miljkovic P, Belanovic Simic S (2022).

**Assessment of land sensitivity to degradation using MEDALUS model - a case study of Grdelica Gorge and Vranjska Valley (southeastern Serbia)**

iForest – Biogeosciences and Forestry – doi: [10.3832/ifor3871-015](https://doi.org/10.3832/ifor3871-015)

Indices	Parameter	Classes	Description	Score	Data Source
	<b>Soil depth (cm)</b> (Penížek and Borůvka 2006; Sepehr et al. 2007)	1	> 75	1.0	Database of the Soil Science Institute and Database of the University of Belgrade Faculty of Forestry
		2	75–30	1.2	
		3	15–30	1.6	
		4	< 15	2.0	
	<b>Organic matter (0–10 cm) (%)</b> (Kosmas et al. 1999; Kosmas et al. 2014)	1	> 6	1.0	
		2	2.1–6.0	1.3	
		3	2.0–1.1	1.6	
		4	< 1.0	2.0	
	<b>Slope gradient (%)</b> (Contador et al. 2009; Bakr et al. 2012; Salvati et al. 2013)	1	< 6	1.0	Digital Elevation Model (DEM)
		2	6–18	1.2	
		3	18–35	1.5	
		4	> 35	2.0	
	<b>Plant cover</b> (Mohamed 2013)	1	> 0.95	1.0	NDVI (USGS 2012)
		2	0.95–0.65	1.2	
		3	0.65–0.35	1.5	
		4	< 0.35	2.0	
<b>Vegetation Quality Index VQI</b>	<b>Erosion protection adjusted according to the NFI data</b> (Contador et al. 2009; Salvati and Bajocco 2011)	1	NFI: Mixed forests—conserved	1.0	NFI (NFI 2009); CORINE Land Cover (CGLS CLC 2012)
		2	NFI: Mixed forests—thinned	1.1	
		3	NFI: Coniferous forests—conserved, Mixed forests—devastated	1.2	
		4	NFI: Coniferous forests—thinned. CORINE: 321, 231, 324	1.3	
		5	NFI: Coniferous forests—devastated	1.4	
		6	NFI: Deciduous forests—conserved	1.5	
		7	NFI: Deciduous forests—thinned	1.6	
		8	NFI: Deciduous forests—devastated, shrubby formations, CORINE: 222	1.7	
		9	CORINE: 243, 333	1.8	
		10	NFI: bare land, CORINE: 211, 221, 242	2.0	

Lukic S, Baumgertel A, Obradovic S, Kadovic R, Beloica J, Pantic D, Miljkovic P, Belanovic Simic S (2022).

**Assessment of land sensitivity to degradation using MEDALUS model - a case study of Grdelica Gorge and Vranjska Valley (southeastern Serbia)**

iForest – Biogeosciences and Forestry – doi: [10.3832/ifor3871-015](https://doi.org/10.3832/ifor3871-015)

Indices	Parameter	Classes	Description	Score	Data Source		
	<b>Drought resistance</b> (Contador et al. 2009; Salvati and Bajocco 2011; Prāvālie et al. 2017; Momirović et al. 2019)	1	324, 333	1.0	CORINE Land Cover (CGLS CLC 2012)		
		2	311, 312, 313, 321	1.2			
		3	221, 222	1.4			
		4	231, 243	1.7			
		5	211, 242	2.0			
	<b>Fire risk adjusted according to the NFI and</b> (Vasić 1992; Contador et al. 2009; Salvati and Bajocco 2011)	1	VI category: bare land, 333, 221, 222	1.0			
		2	V category: beech and other broadleaf forests, 211, 242, 243, 321, 231	1.3			
		3	IV category: oak and hornbeam forests, shrubby formations (NFI), 324	1.4			
		4	III category (NFI)	1.7			
		5	II category: Spruce, fir and other conifer forests	1.9			
Management Quality Index MQI	<b>Policy enforcement adjusted according to the NFI</b>	1	No management interventions/protective function/maintenance of maximum crown cover	1.0	NFI (NFI 2009); CORINE Land Cover (CGLS CLC 2012)		
		2	Regular management interventions—productive function	1.5			
		3	222, 221, 231, 321, shrubby formations, 243	1.7			
		4	bare land	2.0			
	<b>Agricultural intensity</b> (Prāvālie et al. 2017)	1	222, 243, 311, 321, 324, 331	1.0			
		2	211, 231, 241, 242	1.5			
		3	212, 221	2.0			
	Social quality index So QI	<b>Old age index</b> (De Pina Tavares et al. 2015)	1	< 5		1.0	Statistical Yearbooks (SORS)
			2	5–10		1.4	
			3	10–20		1.5	
4			> 20	2.0			
<b>Population density</b> (De Pina Tavares et al. 2015)		1	< 50 people per km <sup>2</sup>	1.0			
		2	50–100	1.4			
		3	100–300	1.5			
		4	> 300	2.0			

**Tab. S2** - Weighting indices for the ability of the stand to provide erosion control.

<b>Forest type/Stand conservation</b>	<b>mixed</b>	<b>coniferous</b>	<b>deciduous</b>
conserved	1.0	1.2	1.5
thinned	1.1	1.3	1.6
devastated	1.2	1.4	1.7