

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

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 11 September 2017

Dear Editor and Authors,

I came through the manuscript 'The hidden ecological resource of andic soils in mountain ecosystems: evidences from Italy', which in my opinion represents a good and substantially novel evaluation of the role of soils with andic properties in non-volcanic mountain environments. Although the Authors evaluated only Italian soils, I agree with them that a similar approach could be successfully tested on other non-volcanic mountain environments worldwide, possibly after some methodological adaptations.

The manuscript is on the whole well-structured and well-written, but a number of minor typing corrections of the English language (e.g. single/plural, verb accordance, articles, etc.) are required. Some sentences are too long and articulated -Italian style- and difficult to read and hence should be shortened or simplified. Some other minor points

have to be clarified in the text. I marked many of them and gave some suggestions in my annotated pdf file, uploaded in the electronic platform.

In my opinion the overall scientific quality of the ms is good. However, I have a major point of concern (see also my annotated pdf), regarding the fact that even though all the sampling sites were indeed in Italian non-volcanic mountain environments, most of them are close to volcanoes, which have been active during Plio-Quaternary times (e.g. Peccerillo, 2005). This point needs to be clearly stated in the rationale behind the objectives of the ms and has to be commented in the Discussion.

As regarding the Conclusions section, it should be more concise and to the point. Moreover, it includes conclusions along with open questions. I suggest to separate these issues in two subsections or change the heading of the section (e.g. Conclusive remarks and future perspectives, or Conclusions and open questions, or something similar).

Figures and tables are of good quality, but geographic coordinates (Lat and Long) and the place names reported in the text (Alps, Apennines, Monte Bianco, etc.) have to be included in the map of figure 1.

Based on the above considerations I'd recommend a minor revision prior to resubm the manuscript.

Best regards,

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2017-57/se-2017-57-RC2-supplement.pdf>

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

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

