

Response to the topical editor 2019-08-20

Dear editor.

Thanks for your kind reception of our manuscript and the proposed modifications following reviewer comments. We hope you will find it fit for publications after the following revisions.

We have attached a separate pdf version of Fig1, as we found it hard to read in the auto-generated version. Do not hesitate to contact us if you need further information or clarification or need higher resolution versions of the figures.

Here are our responses to your comments (in red):

Comment 1:

Comment 7: I could not find the correction in the text.

Response: the line reference in our response to reviewer 1 was to an intermediate version of the manuscript, which was submitted as a supplementary to the responses to reviewer 1, hence it did not correspond to the final version of the manuscript. We were not fully confident with the alternative open review process, so we may have sent too many intermediate versions. We apologise for any inconvenience, and hope you will find the relevant text in line 225 onwards in the attached final and updated version of the manuscript. Otherwise, we refer to the full report sent to the stakeholders (Breuning-Madsen et al. 2015).

Comment 2:

Comment 14 Correcting for coarse fragments has recently been discussed in SOIL by Poeplau et al and Hobley et al. Please note that the gravimetric coarse particle fraction needs to be used. You did not specify 'gravimetric'.

Response: We used the gravimetric coarse soil fraction, which has now been specified in the text (line 380-381). Further, we have added a reference to Hobley et al. 2018.