

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Changes in soil organic carbon and nitrogen capacities of *Salix cheilophila* Schneid along a revegetation chronosequence in semi-arid degraded sandy land of the Gonghe Basin, Tibet Plateau” by Y. Yu and Q. Z. Jia

Y. Yu and Q. Z. Jia

theodoreyy@163.com

Received and published: 24 August 2014

Dear Editor, Thank you very much for your thoughtful comments and considerate suggestions for our manuscript. These comments are valuable and helpful for improving our manuscript. We have made careful modifications and revisions on the original manuscript in response to your suggestions. Editor’s comments: 1. Objectives should be separated in a new paragraph at the end of the introduction section. Response: Thanks very much for the Editor’s thoughtful comment. The objectives were separated in a new paragraph in the revised manuscript. 2. Page 2377, lines 20-22: The three

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



20 m x 20 m and five 1 m x 1 m plots were selected randomly, but how? Using randomly generated coordinates or any other process? Response: Thanks very much for the Editor's comment. After a careful examination of the restoration history including method for afforestation, similar topography, soil texture and site condition, we identified the sampling field for four representative restoration periods. Three 20 x 20 m plots of each restoration periods were immediately adjacent together, the 11-year stand is approximately 0.2 km southwest of the 6-year, the 16-year stand is approximately 1.5 km southeast of 6-year, while the 21-year stand is about 0.8 km in the southeast of 16 year. The general situation of the experiment site please see supplement table 1. Meanwhile, we identified five 1 m x 1 m plots with in each fields and sampled for both accumulated litter and understory plant biomass, the plots were at least 5 m apart from each other and 5 m away from boundary. To some degree, this is the base principle of our randomly sampling. Finally, thanks for your valuable comments once again. We changed the statement in the revised manuscript. 3. Page 2378, lines 1-2: I suggest re-writing depth classes: 0-10, 10-20, 20-30, 30-50, 50-100, 100 -150 and 150-200 cm. Much more easy to understand. Response: Thanks very much for the Editor's thoughtful comment. We re-wrote the depth classes in the revised manuscript. 4. Page 2385, line 19. Please, add some recent references for SOC studies in depth layers Response: Thanks very much for the suggestion. We added the citation in the revised manuscript.

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., 6, 2371, 2014.

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper