

Interactive comment on “Relation of aggregate stability and microbial diversity in an incubated sandy soil” by F. Büks et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 11 April 2016

[12pt]article natbib lineno graphicx enumerate

General Comments

1. The introduction to the discussion paper focusses too greatly on biofilms, EPS composition and formation and bacterial composition with little or no discussion of aggregate stability (the aim of the paper being to relate the former to the latter). Aggregate stability is determined by both biotic and abiotic factors and this should

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



be commented upon.

2. The authors use sonication to disperse aggregates and then measure the release of organic carbon (OC) as a measure of aggregate stability. I am not familiar with any studies which state that aggregate stability can be measured by the quantity of OC released. The authors refer to Kaiser & Berhe as the basis for their method, but in this paper Kaiser & Berhe do not state their approach is a means to measure aggregate stability. Aggregate stability is typically measured by successive reduction in particle size (typically mean weight diameter) of aggregates, not by reference to the quantities of OC released. If it were possible to show a strong linear relationship between aggregate size and OC released then it might be possible to infer aggregate stability, but I do not consider the current approach in the discussion paper to be a measure of aggregate stability. The authors need to justify their approach in the context of the published literature on aggregate stability.

3. The language and grammar used in the paper requires a considerable amount of revision before the paper could be accepted for publication. I have suggested several amendments in the technical corrections but there are many more than this

SOILD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



3. I was not convinced by the evidence that biofilms are formed as a reaction to ecological stress - the citation referred does not relate to this. Please provide clear evidence/citation to this association.
4. What statistical significance can we place on results with only three replicates?
5. Line 219 - 'were separated' - how were the aggregates separated?

Interactive
comment

Technical Corrections

1. Correct spellings are: therefore, proteins,
2. use mineral, not inanimate
3. line 177; create, not receive
4. line 206; addition, not add-on
5. line 217; it is not clear what soil parallels are - please clarify
6. line 264; statistical analysis
7. line 340-341; it is not clear what is meant by 'but between the two and SP_{pure} ',
8. line 480: Our hypothesis was not supported by the data.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

