Solid Earth Discuss.,
doi:10.5194/se-2016-11-RC2, 2016

Solid Earth Discussions
Open Access
EGU

Interactive comment on "Effects of wood chip amendments on the revegetation performance of plant species on eroded marly terrains in a Mediterranean mountainous climate (Southern Alps, France)" *by* V. Breton et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 7 March 2016

The paper of Breton et al. (se-2016-11) presented a study about the effects of wood mulching on the revegetation performance of plant species on marly terrains affected by gully erosion in Southern France. Generally speaking, the paper is interesting, clear and well written. In my opinion, it only requires few changes that would further improve the work. Information about the application rate of mulching is missing. You well described the composition of wood mulch but you did not report any information about how much mulch you had to apply to achieve a homogeneous 5-cm-thick layer. The application rate is a very important aspect for technical and management purposes because, together with the type of mulch, it drives the cost of the application. The

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

article is very interesting from a scientific point of view, but in my opinion, it should be enhanced with the above-mentioned information: i) application rate of mulching and ii) cost of the application rate: how much did you pay for getting the wood chips? In this way, the reader, who may also be a land manager, not only is aware of the effectiveness of wood mulching on the revegetation performance of plant species but also of the possible total cost. Follow some minor changes: 1) Please, in the whole text, refer to as “soil water erosion” rather than “hydric erosion”. 2) Pag. 2, line 19: “play” rather than “plays” 3) Pag. 2, line 31: “Therefore, it. . . “rather than “It therefore. . .” 4) Pag. 3, line 26: “800-1000 m far from. . .”rather than “800-1000 m from. . .” 5) Pag. 4, line 1: “Over the 3-year period, all the most. . .” rather than “Over the 3-year period, the most”. Then, you remove the “all” from the second line. 6) Paragraph 3.1: In my opinion, this paragraph should be removed because of its shortness. The information provided can be re-structured and reported in the other results. 7) Page. 7, line 12: “Garcia-Ruiz et al. (2015), who compared. . .” rather than “Garcia-Ruiz et al. (2015), compared. . .”

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., doi:10.5194/se-2016-11, 2016.