

Interactive comment on “An insight into pre-Columbian raised fields: The case of San Borja, Bolivian lowlands” by Leonor Rodrigues et al.

C. Prat (Referee)

christian.prat@ird.fr

Received and published: 13 June 2016

To avoid repetition, I will not repeat what the reviewer¹ said about the description of this paper. I'm fully agree about the scientific quality of this paper. It is written clearly, well-documented but I think that figures and photos should be improved. Some technical details should be corrected as well as some typing mistakes before publication.

I am surprised that authors with all the information that they have, do not give names to their soils according some soil classification. It could be good if they do it.

In regards to the question of the fertility of the soils, manure during pre-columbian times does not really exist because cattle appears with the Spanish! So, it is more

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



accurate to think fertility in terms of soil fertility, plant rotations, plant associations, fallow, slash and burn systems... In that way, it should be very useful if authors could give information about plants used in these areas by pre-Columbian populations. This could help to understand/resolved the question of fertility.

Another point that author could discuss is the time spend to build a raised field oh 1 ha for instance. Is it possible to do it by few men in few days? weeks? months? Answering to that question will give an argument about the land use occupation: if you need a lot of time, energy etc to build this kind of raised field, obviously you will not abandon it few months after!

Finally, as informations for the authors, it could be useful for them to get informations from the mexican "chinampas" systems which is still functioning in our days in the south of Mexico city.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.soil-discuss.net/soil-2016-27/soil-2016-27-RC2-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on SOIL Discuss., doi:10.5194/soil-2016-27, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

