

## ***Interactive comment on “Soil erosion evolution and spatial correlation analysis in a typical karst geomorphology, using RUSLE with GIS” by Cheng Zeng et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 26 January 2017

This is a carefully done study and the findings are of considerable interest. In this paper, the authors presented some interesting results on the soil erosion evolution and spatial elements of soil erosion in a typical karst geomorphology, and possible driving forces behind the observed changes in soil erosion between 2000 and 2013. The authors attempted to present some qualitative explanations on the spatial impact of soil erosion from detected historical rocky desertification and lithology elements change in Yinjiang County, and they attributed Changes in soil erosion to both impacts of rocky desertifications and lithology. There has been much work done related to soil erosion over area across the world. But studies conducted on a typical karst area is currently lacking. From this regard, the manuscript is interesting and useful. For the benefit of

C1

the reader, however, a number of points need to be clarified and certain statements require further justification, as shown below: 1) The language in s articles must be clear, correct, and unambiguous. Any typographical or grammatical errors should be corrected at revision, so please note any specific errors here. 2) The text must be carefully checked by the authors as it contains several errors. 3) Lines 85-98 References in this part of research background must be updated to nearly five-year research, in order to stand out the forefront of your study. 4) In the part of Study area, it will be better if you can split Figure.1 into two pictures(Location and geological background), which can more clearly express the thinking of your work. 5) In the part of 4.2(Grade shifting of soil erosion intensity in study are), Table.4 is replaced by figure will make your paper better. 6) In the part of Discussionijñit is recommended to add some documents to prove that your research is reasonable. 7) Although this paper is good, it would be ever better if some comparison and validation of existing research results were added. In view of the aforementioned issues, this manuscript can be acceptable after revisions as recommended above.

---

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., doi:10.5194/se-2017-1, 2017.

C2