

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

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 31 August 2017

SE-2017-59 Manuscript Title: Should oasisification be ignored when examining desertification in Northwest China? Authors: Dongwei Gui et al.

Comments:

The subject is very interesting, hence it deserves to be proposed in the SE journal. The basic scientific question in the manuscript was: how the relation between oasisification and desertification processes happen (Page 3 Line 13-14). The manuscript draws attention to the process of oasis expansion, which its subject was clearly treated as the major issue for the research (Page 3 line 15). Other objectives were a) to discuss about the importance of oasis-desert relation research and b) to propose topics for future researches. However, in the manuscript there are certain gaps. I listed below some major weakness points which need to be addressed: a) In fact, what are the

C1

major mechanisms involved in oasis-desert relation? They should be presented accurately and, also observe the good balance of importance among the mechanisms in their presentation. The manuscript did not establish a strong connection between the mechanisms of the oasisification-desertification processes. I think that this can be the major lack in the manuscript. b) In the subsection 2.1. (Description of the desertification process) the readers expect information about the vegetation, water and soil qualities found in oasis and deserts. Concerning the aspects of the desertification process, is the information clear to readers? c) For the readers, it does not clear the anthropogenic pressure contribution in the oasisification or desertification process (subsection 2.2 and conclusions). d) The figures are not clear and they have low information quality provided in the text. The descriptions of the figures in the manuscript should be improved to provide a better understanding of the context by readers (mainly figures 2 and 3). e) The subsection 4.2 (Choice of oasis size. . .) was presented in a detailed way while the 4.1 subsection did not. In fact, the human activity role in oasisification process was underachieved (4.1 subsection). f) On the line 5, page 10, the phrase is too general to explain the process accurately. g) Are you sure that the subtitle 2.2 should repeat the title 2? h) Why the manuscript was proposed as a Short communication instead of a review article? Dear editor, according to your request I have completed my review of the manuscript. In my opinion, the manuscript could not be published at the present state. The Reviewer

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

C2