



Interactive comment on “The role of karst in engineering and environmental geosciences” by H. C. Ho

H. C. Ho

hh455@msstate.edu

Received and published: 14 April 2011

Dear referee,

Thanks for your kindly comment. I would like to address that the text has been proof-read again by native English speaker during the open review period. I believe the final version of the paper will meet the English standard of the journal.

The following are the reply from referee's comments:

1. It is glad to hear from you that Ford and Williams (2007)' definition are the widely-acceptable one. I would appreciate to re-write the paragraph with Ford and Williams' definition. However, at that same time, one of the main aims of this short communication was to review different definitions from karstologists, and most of the definitions

C66

were similar but not exactly the same (especially the classifications of karst landscape). It is doubted if Ford and Williams (2007) definition should be overbold in this paper. Furthermore, the main aim of abstract and section one was not trying to define “what karst is”. It was a brief introduction of karst history, how it related to the karst and how it related to the definition of karst. 2. The “origin of karst” session is actually summarized from Ford and Williams (2007), Palmer (2008) and White (1988). However, if it is not necessary to indicate in this paper, it will be removed from the paragraphs. 3. Thanks for indicating a serious typo from the paper. What I mean “stream erosion” is actually the erosion from groundwater flow and surface runoff. I will fix this typo in the final version of the paper. 4. Although it is not widely-accepted to classify karst as “continental karst” and “island karst”, it is necessary to classify between them. Island karst is formed by mixing zone of water and related to sea-level change. It cannot use common karst model to describe how it was formed. According to the complexity of real situation of global karst, conclusion in “definition” can only be general and would not be making bias statement. 5. The use of surficial, interface and subsurface karst was not to separate karst into different types and not to break down the “karst system as a whole” concept. It was trying to indicate that those zones had very different geomorphologic and hydrologic situations which they should be separated from each other. 6. It is only partially agree with the referee of “Florida is not one of the most complex karst system in the world”. According to geology and topography, it may not be as complicated as Yunnan, China, but it has a particular situation with oceanography (which some of the karst may be from mixing zone erosion instead of groundwater flow). Furthermore, in engineering geosciences' view, the complexity of karst is also related to its land use (which Florida's land use is more complicated than remote karst area). Therefore, although Florida karst will not be the most complicated karst system in the world, it is still one of the most complicated karst system in the world. 7. As it has been mentioned in the first paragraph, the paper has been reviewed again by native English speaker during open review period. The unclear sentences in section 4 and 5 should be fixed in next version of the paper.

C67

Finally, I am really looking forward for the annotated copy of referee's comment for more specific comments and technical corrections (It has not been attached from last referee's comment.)

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., 3, 149, 2011.