

## ***Interactive comment on “Soil erodibility estimation by using five methods of estimating $K$ value: A case study in Ansai watershed of Loess Plateau, China” by Wenwu Zhao et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 30 June 2018

Soil erodibility is significant for the quantitative estimation of soil erosion. The manuscript, entitled Soil erodibility estimation by using five methods of estimating  $K$  value: A case study in Ansai watershed of Loess Plateau, China, tries to find the possible indirect environmental factors of soil erodibility. The topic is interesting. Nevertheless, a major revision is needed before the paper is accepted for publication.

Some of the problems in the manuscript are shown as follows: (1) Abstract. Hardly any quantitative result is found in the abstract. (2) Results. Āš Sections 3.2 and 3.3: where is Tables S1–S5? I try to find the relationships of the text with Tables 1-4, but I am failed. I am sure some tables have been lost in the manuscript. Āš Lines

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



220-222, Page 11: Table 3 in page 22 presents the Principal component analysis (PCA) of environmental attributes, instead of the MDS of the soil erodibility. ĨĆš Some of the tables have been published in a Chinese journal. For example, Figure 2 in the manuscript is similar to Figure 3 in Reference (Zhao et al., 2017). I have uploaded the published paper together with the comments. ĨĆš Too many abbreviations have been found in the manuscript. I think you may make a list for the abbreviations as an accessory of the paper. Moreover, some of the abbreviations are not needed, e.g., the words skewness and kurtosis in Table 2. ĨĆš Errors exist in the annotations. Some of the annotations followed with the tables are duplicated, e.g., the annotations in Tables 1 and 3. I suggest the parameters s in the may be emerge according to their order in the table. I am sorry I could not find SP and SS in Table 1, although the terms have been explained in the annotation. ĨĆš English writing of the manuscript is readable. Nevertheless many language errors exist. I strongly suggest you ask a soil scientist whose native language is English to polish the whole manuscript.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2018-43/se-2018-43-RC2-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2018-43>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

