

Interactive comment on “On soil textural classifications and soil texture-based estimations” by Miguel Ángel Martín et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 3 November 2017

Revision of manuscript: On soil textural classifications and soil texture-based estimations

The proposed manuscript discusses the applicability of different soil texture representations using different textural fraction triplets in order to estimate soil properties. The manuscript addresses relevant questions in the scope of SE and present novel data. The scientific methodology is sound and already published elsewhere, but I think it could be clearly outlined. It is difficult to follow the manuscript methods without reading preview papers from the author. The manuscript is written in a fluent English with the presence of minor misspellings, the number and quality of the provided references is appropriate, and abstract provides a comprehensive and concise summary. Nevertheless, there are some points that need clarification before publication: 1) Abstract|line 4

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



and Conclusion| line 10 state that 6300 soil samples were used as experimental data, but the Materials and Methods section state that "... a total of 6240 soil samples were included..." (line 2 – page 3). Are authors rounding the number 6240? If so, it would be better to state something like around 6200 or circa 6200. 2) The first phrase of Materials and Methods is identical to the one presented at Martin et al (2017a) -reference of the present manuscript. Is the intention stated the reason for the use of the dataset? The same reason as given in Martin et al (2017a)? 3) Section 2.2 presents the formation of all possible triplets using seven fractions. Maybe authors could present a table with such triplets or point to table 3 where triplets are presented. 4) Section 3.1|from line 14 addresses table 1 results. The stated results are confusing. Are the standard triplets on the central column and 3-2-2 triplets on the right column? Is it the other way around? What is 5-1-1 triplet indicated on table 1? 5) Discussion section|phrase on line 14 ("Rather ...). Please rephrase it, because it is not clear. 6) Discussion section|phrase on line 19 ("The diameter..."). Is figure 2 supposed to illustrate what it is stated? I cannot see it in the figure. 7) Page 6|line 28. Reformulate because clearly there is something missing. 8) Figure 1 b) would benefit from putting 3-2-2 triplet on the caption. 9) Table 2 - "being not different"? Also, I am attaching a PDF file with the minor misspellings found on the manuscript.

From all the above is my belief that the present manuscript should be accepted subject to minor revision.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2017-84/se-2017-84-RC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2017-84>, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

