

## ***Interactive comment on* “The hidden ecological resource of andic soils in mountain ecosystems: evidences from Italy” by Fabio Terribile et al.**

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 29 August 2017

The paper “The hidden ecological resource of andic soils in mountain ecosystems: evidences from Italy” has an interesting way to look upon Andic soils and provide new insight in the Italian non volcanic mountain environments. It can be seen as a promising step forward in this field.

The presented manuscript is within the scope of the SE and represents a good contribution to the scientific progress. Novel data and ideas with known tools and concepts are used to provide new insight in the field. The quality and presentation of the scientific results is fair.

The methods and assumption are partly valid and not always clearly outlined. A reproduction by fellow scientist might be difficult as well as the traceability of results, due to the lack of presented data.

The authors do not give proper credit to mentioned methods, as several references seem to be missing. A differentiation of new/original contribution to literature data could be strongly improved, as not all data is transparently provided.

Nevertheless the title clearly reflects the content of the paper. The abstract is fairly concise. The overall presentation is still poor in structure, although version 2 is a clear improvement to version 1. The language is fluent, but in certain parts neither precise nor grammatically correct. Abbreviation, symbols etc. are mostly defined correctly.

Suggesting for certain parts of the paper, which should be clarified and reworked, are provided accordingly on the following pages of this review supplement. The number of references could be improved, as stated in the reference section.

Overall, the second version of the manuscript is a great improvement to the original version 1. Nevertheless, the manuscript is still in need of further refining.

The supplementary PDF includes a detailed list of comments for the authors, including the following main suggestions:

Several sentence structures should be shorten to improve readability.

A thorough grammar correction of the entire manuscript is needed and a re-evaluation of certain wordings.

The presented manuscript lacks throughout several section on precision and transparency regarding data and methods. It is often unclear why data is spared or used for a certain purpose, or data that is used and not provided in the manuscript in full.

Therefore it is strongly advised to refine the manuscript. Adding missing explanations together with a comprehensible reasoning of certain steps to provide a more transparent and clearer picture of the study.

Furthermore, additional references for certain themes (especially within the method and discussion section) should be added.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Tables and figures should be meticulously corrected, as they do not reflect identical data. A distinguishing between new and literature data is besides a mentioning in section 2.2, not given, and has to be improved.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2017-57/se-2017-57-RC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2017-57>, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

