

**Journal:** Solid Earth Discuss., 6, 3111–3139, 2014

**Manuscript ID:** SE-2014-109

**Type:** Research Article

**Title:** Responses of vertical soil moisture to rainfall pulses and land uses in a typical loess hilly area, China

**Short title:**

## General Comments

This paper attempts to analyze the response of soil moisture variations to rainfall pulses by in-situ consecutive monitoring of five typical vegetation types in the loess hilly area of China, including artificial grassland, cropland, shrubland, woodland and native grassland both during and after each rainfall pulse at plot scale. This manuscript would be of interest to readers of Solid Earth, ***BUT the article would not be acceptable for the journal in the present form. I suggest minor revision. In general, the English should be improved.***

## Detailed Comments

Before making any comment, I have read the paper carefully and I have seen that the paper would be improved if the following comments were accepted by the authors

### ABSTRACT

The authors state that ...

*“In this study, vertical soil moisture variations of woodland (Pinus tabulaeformis), native grassland (Stipa bungeana), shrubland (Hippophae rhamnoides), cropland (Triticum aestivum) and artificial grassland (Onobrychis viciaefolia) in five soil profiles were monitored in a typical loess hilly area during the 2010 growing season”.*

I have searched the characteristics of these five soil profiles in the paper and I have not found anything. Please to add a table with the main features of the five soil profiles, for horizons or for soil control sections. Indicating at least texture, porosity, organic matter, bulk density ... etc. I think that these parameters are essentials to analyze the variations of soil moisture regime as a function of use, especially in Calcic Cambisol, characterized by cambic horizon presence (Bw).

The rest of the abstract is very clear

## **INTRODUCTION**

The authors reported the precipitation effects only. Indicating issues that are known. Nevertheless they do not indicate anything about the soils physical and chemical properties in Cambisols, which obviously affect to soil moisture regime.

In this respect, I recommend that the authors should read some paper of Parras-Alcántara or Lozano-García that have studied physical and chemical properties in Cambisols in semiarid environments, plus some Pf. Cerdá paper.

In addition SE is international journal, the paper will give a more global vision. Hereby the introduction would be improved enough

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### **Study site**

Regarding the study area I have some questions .... please clarify.

- ...annual mean precipitation of 408mm (1958–2004). Is not information very ancient?
- ...The mean annual potential transpiration is 1510 mm. ...potential transpiration or potential evapotranspiration?
- ... The soil at the study site is of the Calcic Cambisol group in the FAO-UNESCO classification system (FAO-UNESCO, 1974).... Why a more recent classification is not used?...for example...IUSS-ISRIC-FAO, 2006. World Reference Base for Soil Resources. International Union of Soil Science, International Soil Reference and Information Centre. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy.
- It exhibits a unique texture composed of 50% silt (0.01–0.05 mm), 39% clay (< 0.01 mm) and 11% sand (> 0.05 mm)... These data do not provide information on soil.... these data are mean soil values?
- The soil thickness varies from 40 to 60 m in the same region.... these data are correct?.

As I said before it would be interesting to incorporate soil physical-chemical properties, beside updating some information.

### **Experimental design, Measurement sensor and Statistical analysis,**

It's all right.

## **RESULTS**

The results are well prepared.

But, I think that to clarify and justify the results you should start with physical-chemical soil analysis by horizons or soil control section (0-20, 20-40...etc). Also, you should take into account land use, and even take into account the land use change occurred in the study area. It is also important that you clarify management especially in grassland (native and artificial)

## **DISCUSSION**

Similar to results.

The discussion is poor, mixing results and not clarifying the basic questions of work done. The discussion should be shorter and concise.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Regarding the conclusions are quite clear, but it could improve a lot if you will incorporate physical parameters such as texture, bulk density, organic matter, porosity ... etc.