

Interactive comment on “Should oasisification be ignored when examining desertification in Northwest China?” by Dongwei Gui et al.

Dongwei Gui et al.

xuejie11@mailsucas.ac.cn

Received and published: 18 October 2017

1. the abstract need major revision. the objectives are too broad. the author need to focus on one of the points as stated in the manuscript rather than focus on-all-three aspect. build up the idea of the equation and focus to one specific point. a review paper is better suited to summarize if the author choose to focus on 3 aspect at once. A: In the revised version, we have provided a major revision for abstract. It is correct that the objectives are two broad in the original version. In the revised version, we have narrow our paper purpose, in the page 4 line 23 to page 5 line 8, we mentioned "The aim of this research is to elucidate the importance of oasisification and its research through 1) examining oasisification characteristics in recent decades in Northwest China, and 2) clarifying the logical relationship between oasisification and desertification

C1

in arid regions. Then, based on the current state of the oasis research progress, we propose important topics for future oasisification research. Finally, we hope to arouse more researchers' attention on oasisification rather than just on desertification in arid area." Since the purpose of this manuscript is to answer why the oasisification shouldn't be ignored in NW China. In order to answer this question clearly, we need elucidate the oasisification characteristics in recent decades in Northwest China. We need to understand the logical relation between oasisification and desertification in arid area in theory. However, it is not enough to just emphasize the importance of oasisification research. We need to propose its research direction for reader to discuss. We think these contents are together to answer our question, and it is not completed if ignore anyone aspect. 2. in the model equation, many variables put in place are highly open for discussion, thus not conclusive. A: Yes, we set this paper as viewpoint/discussion paper, and just want express our understanding in oasisification, and we prepare each section as more macro perspective rather than micro perspective or case study. In the model equation, actually it is a conception model. We established the model and provide parameters to readers, it is also discussed as a macro perspective. If we use a case study to use the model, the paper will become one another type, we will do that in the future. 3. introduction is acceptable, with minor revision. A: Yes, we have revised and any change can be found in the new verison. 4. results and discussion are too vague. difficult to understand the focus of the oasisification study as suggested by the author. A: We have tried our best to revised, and change can be found in the track-changes version. 5. figures are not supportive of the discussion/idea of improvement for oasisification research. A: There are three figures in this manuscript. In the revised version, figure 1 shown readers the oases distribution in NW China, it is one basic figure. Figure 2 (it is figure 3 in the original version) is just shown readers how the oasisification process happen in NW China, this figure is not clear, we have revised. Figure 3 (it is figure 2 in the original version) is a conception map, help us to understand the logical process of oasisification and desertification happen in arid area . We think the figure 3 is the essence and the most important content in this manuscript,

C2

if we provide a detail flow chart, it is difficult to reflect these logical relation between oasification and desertification in arid area. 6. the flow chart is still at initial stage of development, thus need further clarification on the flow. A: Just we mentioned on above. As one viewpoint paper, we hope express the relation between oasification and desertification happen with a logic way. 7. the conclusion too long and not focused. A: In the revised version, the "Conclusion" section has been changed as "Discussion and conclusion" . And, we have revised this section and try to focused.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2017-59/se-2017-59-AC3-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2017-59>, 2017.