https://doi.org/10.5194/soil-2019-10-RC2, 2019 © Author(s) 2019. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



SOILD

Interactive comment

Interactive comment on "Changes in soil properties in a low-quality broadleaf mixed forest after cutting strip reforms in a 9-year period in Northeastern China" by Huiwen Guan et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 4 July 2019

The submitted manuscript "Changes in soil properties in a low-quality broadleaf mixed forest after cutting strip reforms in a 9-year period in Northeastern China" describes the impacts of timber cutting on selected physical and chemical soil properties throughout a nine year period. Such data from long-term experiment are sparse and, therefore, the information given in this paper is valuable for forest management. Nevertheless, the in the current state the manuscript is not ready to be published.

In the Introduction section the objectives need to be outlined more clearly. The authors talk about overall soil properties but they investigated only selected physical and chemical soil parameters. Materials and methods should be explained more in

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



detail. Number of soil samples and depths of sampling are not mentioned as well as if replications were taken. Soil physical parameters and the methods of analyses should be better described as they are not commonly used in soil physics. Basic soil physical and chemical parameters of the plots should be included. Statistical analyses are performed but the used analyses are not described. Although the results of physical and chemical parameters show no significant differences. The calculated soil quality index is based on 13 indicators which are interacting like total nitrogen, water soluble nitrogen etc. Determining a soil quality index should use indicators which are to interfering each other. The tables are not easy to interpret. I suggest the same layout for all tables or to display the results in figures instead. Results are not well explained and discussion section could be more elaborated. Overall, the manuscript is difficult to understand and needs improvements.

Please also note the supplement to this comment: https://www.soil-discuss.net/soil-2019-10/soil-2019-10-RC2-supplement.pdf

Interactive comment on SOIL Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/soil-2019-10, 2019.

SOILD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

