

5 Disaggregating a Regional Extent Digital Soil Map using Bayesian Area-to-Point Regression Kriging for Farm-Scale Soil Carbon Assessment

Sanjeevani Nimalka Somarathna Pallegedara Dewage^{1, 2}, Budiman Minasny¹, Brendan Malone^{1, 2},

10 ¹ Sydney Institute of Agriculture, School of Life and Environmental Sciences, The University of Sydney, 1 Central Avenue, Australian Technology Park, Eveleigh, NSW, 2015, Australia.

² CSIRO Agriculture and Food, Australia.

15 *Correspondence to:* Sanjeevani Nimalka Somarathna Pallegedara Dewage (sanjeevanis@gmail.com)

Abstract

Most soil management activities are implemented at farm scale, yet digital soil maps are commonly available at regional¹ or national scale. Disaggregating these regional/national maps ^{is} to be applicable for farm scale tasks particularly in data poor or limited situations. Although disaggregation is a frequently discussed topic in recent ^{DSM}Digital soil mapping literature, the uncertainty of the disaggregation process is not often discussed. Underestimation of inferential or predictive uncertainty in statistical modelling leads to inaccurate statistical summaries and overconfident decisions. The use of Bayesian inference allows for quantifying the uncertainty associated with the disaggregation process. In this study, a framework of Bayesian Area-to-Point Regression Kriging (ATPRK) is proposed for downscaling soil attributes, in particular, maps of soil organic carbon. Estimation of point support variogram from block supported data, was carried out using the Monte Carlo integration via the Metropolis-Hasting Algorithm. A regional soil carbon map with a resolution of 100 m (block support) was disaggregated to 10 m (point support) information for a farm in the northern NSW, Australia. The derived point support variogram has a higher partial sill and nugget while the range and parameters do not deviate much from the block support data. The disaggregated fine-scale map (point support with a grid spacing of 10m) using Bayesian ATPRK had an 87% concordance correlation with the original coarse scale map. The uncertainty estimates of the disaggregation process were given by a 95% confidence interval (CI) limits. Narrow CI limits indicate, the disaggregation process gives a fair approximation of mean SOC content of the study site. The Bayesian ATPRK approach was compared with dissever; a regression-based disaggregation algorithm. The disaggregated maps generated by dissever had 96% concordance correlation with the coarse-scale map. dissever achieves this higher concordance correlation through an iteration process while Bayesian ATPRK is a one-step process. The two disaggregated products were validated with 127 independent topsoil carbon observations. The validation concordance correlation coefficient for Bayesian ATPRK disaggregation was 23% while downscaled maps generated from dissever had 18% CCC. The advantages and limitations of both disaggregation algorithms are discussed.

1 Introduction

The proliferation of digital soil mapping (DSM) and modelling techniques during the past decade has made available vast amounts of digital soil information (Lagacherie, 2008; Grunwald, 2009; Minasny and McBratney, 2016). For example, the GlobalSoilMap project (Arrouays et al., 2014) aspired towards delivering a global coverage of soil attributes at 100 m resolution for all ~~five~~^{six} standard soil depths. The Soil and Landscape grid of Australia (Grundy et al., 2015), maps of topsoil organic carbon content across Europe (de Brogniez et al., 2015), national digital soil maps of France (Mulder et al., 2016), and carbon map of Nigeria (Akpa et al., 2016) are examples of large extent digital soil mapping ~~(DSM)~~. However, these national or regional digital maps do not capture the sufficient spatial variability of soil for farm-scale decision making (Malone et al., 2017). Yet these maps can be converted into useful farm scale information using a combination of fine-scale environmental covariates and geostatistical methods. This process is called downscaling or disaggregation (Malone et al., 2017).

Disaggregation is the process of detailing information collected at a small or coarse scale towards a larger or finer scale (Cheng, 2008). Disaggregating techniques can be classified into ~~to~~ two categories; geostatistical and regression techniques. Area to point kriging (ATPK) (Kyriakidis, 2004) and its variants such as area to point regression kriging (ATPRK) are the most common geostatistical techniques applied to disaggregate soil resource information. Incorporating both point and areal data in the kriging system is such a variant of ATPK presented by Goovaerts (2011). That study demonstrated ATPK to map the variability within soil units and secondly introduced a general formulation for incorporating area-to-area, area-to-point, and point-to-point covariance in the kriging system. Replacing the areal mean with summary statistics in the kriging system is another improved ATPK technique suggested by Orton et al. (2014). Román Dobarco et al. (2016) extended this approach using summary statistics in the ATPRK system. Further, a Bayesian regression kriging ~~approach~~^{model} was presented by Ramos et al. (2013). ~~The model used a~~^{They introduced} Gaussian process model, ~~and it is as~~ a novel image fusion technique for panchromatic sharpening of low-resolution satellite images ~~using~~. ~~They used~~ images from unmanned aerial vehicle flown over agricultural fields ~~to demonstrate their model~~.

Regression approaches are also a popular approach to downscale soil attributes. For example, Malone et al. (2012), formalised a statistical downscaling algorithm; dissever based on the Liu and Pu (2008) algorithm for downscaling continuous earth resources with a case study of downscaling soil organic carbon content. This method was refined by Roudier et al. (2017), allowing the user to choose between a range of regression models apart from the originally contained Generalised additive models (GAM). “DSMART” (Disaggregation and Harmonisations of Soil Map Units through Resampled Classification Trees) is another popular regression-based approach; proposed by Odgers et al. (2014) to downscale soil map units to soil series information. However it is different to the discussed method since there is no fine gridding involved.

Disaggregation is a change of support problem (Cressie, 1991; Gotway and Young, 2002). Spatial support is the geometrical size, shape orientation spatial unit of an observation or a prediction. In the disaggregation process, when the support changes the associated statistical and spatial properties of the variable also change, adding a major source of uncertainty (Truong et al., 2014). ATPK is a theoretically-based method that uses the classical kriging principles to predict at point support using block support information (Kyriakidis, 2004). Incorporating fine scale covariate data in the kriging system (ATPRK) is superior to ATPK as it allows

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: English (Australia)

80 for within class variability, spatial autocorrelation and also [ancillary covariates representing](#) “scorpan” factors (McBratney et al., 2003) ~~represented by ancillary covariates~~; (Kerry et al., 2012).

In disaggregating soil information, quantifying the uncertainties of this process is not often discussed. Underestimation of inferential or predictive uncertainty in statistical modelling can lead to inaccurate statistical summaries and overconfident decisions (Draper, 1995). Therefore, it is important to account for the
85 [underlying](#) parameter uncertainty associated with the disaggregation process. The use of Bayesian inference in ATPRK system enables quantifying the uncertainty associated with inferring point support parameters from the block supported system, in addition to estimating the product uncertainty (Diggle et al., 1998).

To the best of our knowledge, Bayesian ATPRK has not been used for downscaling soil information. In this paper, we present a Bayesian ATPRK approach for downscaling soil attributes. Specifically, the study focuses
90 on downscaling regional soil organic carbon ([SOC](#)) maps to high-resolution farm scale maps. ~~Soil organic carbon~~ [SOC](#) is arguably a key soil property due to its conferring benefits to the soil physical and chemical properties and potential to store atmospheric carbon. Accurate estimations of SOC stocks at farm scale are important for precision agricultural needs. In addition, the fine-scale maps can be used for designing sampling strategies for quantification of SOC stocks (de Gruijter et al., 2016) required by carbon sequestration auditing
95 process such as carbon farming initiatives in Australia (Malone et al., 2017).

A regional soil carbon map with a resolution of 100 m (block support) was disaggregated into 10 m (point support) information for a farm in the Spring Ridge region in the northern NSW. Application of the Bayesian ATPRK approach is presented and demonstrated within the study. In addition, a comparative analysis with the dissever algorithm, a regression-based downscaling method, is performed to assess the performance of Bayesian
100 ATPRK in the context of spatial downscaling of digital soil carbon mapping.

2 Theoretical background

Assuming we are observing a continuous Gaussian process, we denote the process as $S(p)$ for locations $p \in D$, where D is the region of interest. For block support (B) data, where $B \subset D$, we presume that the observations are
105 as block averages:

$$\mathbf{S}(B) = |B|^{-1} \int_B \mathbf{S}(p) dp \quad (1)$$

where $|B|$ denotes the area of B .

The underlying Gaussian process S can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{S} = \sum_{k=0}^l \mathbf{m} \beta + \varepsilon \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{m} is the design matrix of the trend function and β vector of coefficients, and ε is the stochastic residuals with mean of zero and covariance function $C(\theta)$, where θ represent the parameters of the covariance function. Since the block supported observations; \mathbf{S}_B and point support observations; \mathbf{S}_p are jointly Gaussian, the prediction
115 problem can be introduced as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S}_p \\ \mathbf{S}_B \end{bmatrix} \sim N \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{m} \\ \mathbf{M} \end{bmatrix} \beta, \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}_{pp} & \mathbf{C}_{pB} \\ \mathbf{C}_{Bp} & \mathbf{C}_{BB} \end{bmatrix} \right) \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{C}_{pp} is the variance-covariance matrix of \mathbf{S}_p , \mathbf{C}_{BB} the variance-covariance matrix of \mathbf{S}_B , \mathbf{C}_{pB} and \mathbf{C}_{Bp} are the variance-covariance matrices between \mathbf{S}_p and \mathbf{S}_B and vice versa. \mathbf{m} is the design matrix of for fine-scale covariates of \mathbf{S}_p .

Since the joint distribution is Gaussian the optimal predictions at unsampled point locations can be given as,

$$\hat{\mathbf{S}}_p = \mathbf{m}'\beta + \mathbf{C}_{pB}'\mathbf{C}_{BB}^{-1}(\mathbf{S}_B - \mathbf{M}\beta) \quad (4)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_p$ is the vector of predicted soil carbon at [N-pointpoints](#).

And the variance-covariance matrix for the prediction error is,

$$\text{var}(\mathbf{S}_p|\mathbf{S}_B) = \mathbf{C}_{pp} - \mathbf{C}_{pB}\mathbf{C}_{BB}^{-1}\mathbf{C}_{pB}' \quad (5)$$

This shows that the inference of \mathbf{S}_p from \mathbf{S}_B is straightforward and resembles a simple kriging formulation (Cressie and Wikle, 2011). However, the estimation of point support variogram from the block support data is not a trivial task. Usually, the estimation is done via deregulation or deconvolution of the empirical variogram. Goovaerts (2008); Gotway and Young (2007); Pardo-Igúzquiza and Atkinson (2007) proposed an iterative numerical procedure for the deconvolution of the block support variogram for irregular block support. Wang et al. (2015) suggested an integration approach, while Nagle et al. (2011) used a maximum likelihood approach. Gelfand et al. (2001) used Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) integration to estimate point support variogram from block support data where the parameters of point support variogram were given as non-informative priors. Truong et al. (2014) used a similar approach, but the parameters of the point support variogram were given as informative priors. In this paper, the variogram parameters were inferred directly from the data via Bayesian estimation [with an objective of inferring the uncertainty of the disaggregation process](#).

140

2.1 Bayesian inference

The likelihood function of Gaussian process S can be given as $f(\mathbf{S})|\beta, \theta = N(\mathbf{m}\beta, \mathbf{C}(\theta))$. \mathbf{C} is a function of the Euclidean distance h , with the vector of parameters θ . Then the likelihood of predictive distribution at point locations can be given as,

$$f(\mathbf{S}_p|\mathbf{S}_B) = \int f(\mathbf{S}_p|\mathbf{S}_B; \beta, \theta) f(\beta, \theta | \mathbf{S}_B) d\beta d\theta \quad (6)$$

Where $\mathbf{S}_p|\mathbf{S}_B, \beta, \theta$ is distributed as

$$N(\mathbf{M}\beta + \mathbf{C}_{BP}'(\theta)\mathbf{C}_{pp}^{-1}(\theta)(\mathbf{S}_p - \mathbf{m}\beta), \mathbf{C}_{BB}(\theta) - \mathbf{C}_{BP}'(\theta)\mathbf{C}_{pp}^{-1}(\theta)\mathbf{C}_{Bp}(\theta)) \quad (7)$$

Each entry of the distribution can be estimated through a Monte Carlo integration. Then we can replace Eq. 3 with

$\hat{f}((\mathbf{S}_p, \mathbf{S}_B)' | \beta, \theta)$, where 'hat' denotes a Monte Carlo integration. Then it is apparent that,

$$\hat{f}((\mathbf{S}_p, \mathbf{S}_B)' | \beta, \theta) = f((\mathbf{S}_p, \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_B)' | \beta, \theta) \quad (8)$$

To predict at $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_p$ we require $f(\mathbf{S}_p, \mathbf{S}_B)$, which is given by Eq. 3. Using $\hat{f}((\mathbf{S}_p, \mathbf{S}_B)' | \beta, \theta)$, and using Eq. 8 we
 155 can obtain $f((\mathbf{S}_p, \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_B) | \beta, \theta)$ to sample $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_p$.

Then given the priors $[\beta, \theta]$, the Bayesian model is specified, and a Monte Carlo fitting procedure can be carried
 out to maximise following log likelihood function. A complete description of deducing the Bayesian area to point
 inference can be found in Gelfand et al. (2001).

$$160 \quad \mathbf{L}(\beta, \theta | \mathbf{S}_B) = \frac{n}{2} \log(2\pi) + \frac{1}{2} \log |\mathbf{C}_{BB}| - \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{S}_B - \mathbf{M}\beta)^T \mathbf{C}_{BB}^{-1} (\mathbf{S}_B - \mathbf{M}\beta) \quad (9)$$

Where \mathbf{C}_{BB} is block to block covariance and can be approximately calculated as

$$\mathbf{C}_{BB(i,j)} = \begin{cases} \frac{c_1}{K} + \left(\frac{2}{K(K-1)}\right) \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l>k}^K (c_1 + c_0 - \gamma_p(s_k - s_l)), & i \neq j \\ \frac{1}{K^2} (c_1 + c_0 - \gamma_p(s_k - s_l)), & i = j \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

165 Where i, j index are block supported observations, k, l index discretised points within a block and K is the number
 of discretisation points per block (Truong et al., 2014). c_1, c_0 are the partial sill and the nugget component of the
 semivariogram; γ_p .

170

3 Case study

3.1 Study area and coarse scale soil carbon map

We illustrate the methodology by disaggregating a regional topsoil organic carbon map of the University of
 Sydney E. J. Holtsbaum Agricultural Research Station (Fig. 1). The landholding, also known as “Nowley”, is
 175 located in the Spring Ridge district of the central/north west slopes region of NSW, Australia. Its area is
 approximately 2300ha and is managed as a mixed farming enterprise of cattle grazing throughout the year, and
 wheat, barley, and canola in winter, and sorghum and sunflower in the summer. Cropping is performed on soils
 derived from basalt parent materials. The average annual rainfall is 600mm.

The available map is a New South Wales (NSW) topsoil carbon map, which was generated using a local
 180 regression kriging technique (Somarathna et al., 2016). These maps are analogues to the nationally available soil
 carbon maps of Australia which are available in separate layers corresponding to the depth intervals definition in
 the GlobalSoilMap product specifications (Arrouays et al., 2014). The standard soil depth layers are 0-5cm, 5-
 15cm, 15-30cm, 30-60cm, and 60-100cm.

This NSW soil carbon map has grid spacing 100m x 100m, with block support of the same size. Hence,
 185 map spatial resolution and the support are equal, which in turn mean that the pixel values that make up the map
 represent a predicted mean for the area of each pixel. Commonly the pixel values of a digital soil map are on point
 support, with the pixel value representing the value at a point usually at the centre of each pixel (Malone et al.,
 2013). Therefore, block kriging was used convert the maps to point supported maps before the analysis.

190 The topsoil of the study area was represented by the depth interval of 0-7.5 cm, as this was the depth
 interval used in previous work conducted at this site for soil carbon auditing (de Gruijter et al., 2016). The
 respective coarse (NSW) map for the 0-7.5cm depth interval was predicted by using mass-preserving splines
 (Malone et al., 2009) of the 0-5cm and 5-15cm standardised maps. This map will be hereafter referred to as the
 coarse scale map. It is this map that subsequent descriptions of spatial downscaling will refer to. The experimental
 variogram of the block supported coarse scale map is given in Fig. 2.

195

3.2 Environmental covariates

Elevation, topographic wetness index (TWI), Gamma radiometric Thorium, gamma radiometric potassium,
 Landsat band 4 and Landsat band 7 were used as environmental covariates in the spatial downscaling model.
 Landsat data has a resolution of 30m. Since the coarse map was disaggregated into 10m resolution, the Landsat
 data were pan-sharpened using the panchromatic band (15m), and then resampled to 10m.

200 The elevation data had been collected during a ground survey using an all-terrain vehicle at with 20m
 swath. Then the data were processed using a local block kriging approach to produce an elevation data at a 10m
 resolution. Based on the [developed digital elevation model \(DEM\)](#), the [Topographic Wetness Index \(TWI\)](#)
 was derived. The gamma radiometric data was derived from aerial survey (Minty et al., 2009) which were resampled
 to 10m. A more detailed description of data collection and post-processing can be found in Malone et al. (2017).

205

3.3 Model parameter inferencing using the MCMC simulation

210 Suppose our observed soil carbon data (S) follows a second-order stationary Gaussian process which is
 characterised by the mean (trend) and the variogram where $S_p \sim N(S_p, \gamma_p)$ where $\gamma_p = (h, \theta)$; is a function
 of Euclidian distance h and θ vector of parameters of Matérn variogram (Eq. 14). The block averages S_B
 have the same spatial mean as S_p but a different spatial structure (Gotway and Young, 2002). The block support
 covariance C_{BB} is also a function of h with parameter vector of θ but has a different support.

$$215 \quad C_{ij} = c_0 \delta_{ij} + c_1 \left[\frac{1}{2^{v-1} \Gamma(v)} \left(\frac{h}{r} \right)^v K_v \left(\frac{h}{r} \right) \right] \quad (11)$$

where C_{ij} is the covariance between observation i and j , h represents the separation distance between i and j ,
 δ_{ij} denotes the Kronecker delta ($\delta_{ij} = 1$ if $i=j$ and $\delta_{ij} = 0$ when $i \neq j$), $c_0 + c_1$ signifies the sill variance, K_v is the
 modified Bessel function of the second kind of order v . Γ is the gamma function, r denotes the distance or 'range'
 parameter and v is the spatial 'smoothness'. Calculating C_{BB} requires discretisation and it was done using a regular
 grid pattern, with equal 10m spacing between discretising points within a block. Then C_{BB} was calculated
 according to Eq. 11.

220 The priors were given as informative priors and considered as normally distributed. The coarse scale soil
 carbon map was regressed against the selected covariates to estimate the approximate prior values for the
 coefficient of the linear trend (β). Gaussian priors were assigned for both spatial trend (β) and covariance
 225

component (θ) of the spatial model. MCMC integration was carried out using the Metropolis Hasting algorithm. Metropolis Hasting is a computationally efficient algorithm that allows sampling from conditional distributions (Diggle et al., 1998). Calibration of the model was done using two parallel chains of MCMC with 100 000 iterations.

230

3.4 Spatial prediction

The mean, 95% upper and lower CI limits of spatial model parameters were calculated using the values of the last 10 000 MCMC iterations. These calibrated parameters were used to predict SOC content at the fine scale. The predictions were made on to the 10m x 10m points based on Eq. 4.

235

3.5 Disaggregation using dissever

The proposed Bayesian model also compared with [the dissever regression](#)-based disaggregation approach. dissever is a regression-based downscaling approach proposed by Malone et al. (2012). dissever operates in two steps; initialisation and iteration. At initialisation step, the coarse map is resampled using nearest neighbour resampling technique to match the resolution of available fine scale covariates. Then the resampled map is regressed against the fine scale covariates. Next, the regressed fine map is upscaled through averaging, and then the mass balance deviation (deviation factor; DF) from the coarse map is calculated. The regressed fine map is corrected using the DF, and then the algorithm progresses to the iteration step. In the iteration step, regression and upscaling continue until the mass balance deviation between the upscaled map and the original map is less than a set minimum (threshold). The following flow diagram (Fig. 3) is an illustrative description of the dissever algorithm. This differs from Bayesian ATPRK since it is not focused to address the change of support problem and it is a fine gridding exercise. A detailed and comprehensive account of dissever can be found in Malone et al. (2012) and Malone et al. (2017).

240

245

250

Following the procedure mentioned above, the coarse scale carbon map of the area was disaggregated into 10m using dissever. The environmental covariates used in the Bayesian approach were similarly made available for dissever.

255

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

260 3.6 Independent validation

3.6.1 Validation data

265 The accuracy of the model was tested using an independent dataset which consists of 127 soil samples from 0 -
7.5cm soil cores (cross-section area of 41 cm² and height of 7.5 cm). The samples are considered to have point
support. This data was collected over two separate soil surveys during 2014 and 2015 using stratified random
270 sampling. Stratification was based on the SOC prediction fields generated from digital soil mapping. A detailed
description about the stratified random sampling process can be found in de Gruijter et al. (2016). The carbon
content of collected soil cores was measured using dry combustion by a vario-MAX/Elementar Vario Max CNS
macro elemental analyser: (Elementar Analyses System GmbH, Hanau, Germany). The measured carbon contents
are in carbon concentrations (g of C per 100 g of soil).

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: English (Australia)

Formatted: English (Australia)

3.6.2 Validation statistics

The model accuracy was compared using Mean squared error (MSE) and Lins' concordance correlation coefficient (CCC) (Lin, 1989) between the disaggregated values and observed independent values at sampling points.

275 CCC is given by

$$CCC = \frac{2\rho\sigma_x\sigma_y}{\sigma_x^2 + \sigma_y^2 + (\mu_x - \mu_y)^2} \quad (12)$$

Where ρ is the correlation coefficient, σ_x , σ_y are the variances of observed (x) and predicted (y) values and μ_x , μ_y are the respective means. CCC is scaled between -1 and 1, the latter implying perfect agreement and the former implying perfect reverse agreement.

280

MSE is given by

$$MSE = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n'} (S_p - \hat{S}_{p'})^2}{n'} \quad (13)$$

285 where S_p is the observed values of SOC at independent sampling points, $\hat{S}_{p'}$ predicted SOC values at the fine scale and n' number of independent SOC samples at a fine scale. MSE is an indication of the accuracy of predictions, while CCC indicates both accuracy and precision of the disaggregation exercise.

4 Results and Discussion

290 The use of Linear mixed model (LMM) as the spatial prediction model allows integration of fine-scale covariate information and spatial correlation in a single model. Unlike regression kriging in which regression and residual kriging are used in two phases of modelling, LMM is a one-step process. We used Bayesian inference techniques to estimate parameters of LMM to deliver uncertainty estimates of model parameters. This section

295 provides a description of posterior parameters of the spatial model followed by a comparison of spatial disaggregated maps using Bayesian ATPRK and [Disseverdissever](#).

4.1 Bayesian parameter estimation of the spatial model

300 Fig. 4 illustrates the posterior statistics of the linear trend parameters. The upper diagonal panel displays correlation coefficients among the covariates, the lower diagonal depicts the scatter plots, while the diagonal shows the posterior distributions. The diagonal histograms are well defined which indicates that all parameters of the linear trend are relatively well-defined. The correlations among covariates are minimal, which [indicateindicates](#) that there is no multicollinearity between the covariates.

305 Fig. 5 displays the posterior distribution of Matérn variogram parameters and their correlations. Posterior values of the range parameter are ~~more or less~~ similar to the prior values. However, the partial sill and nugget parameters are different from their priors. The posterior partial sill is higher than the prior sill, which agrees with the fact that the coarse scale variability of soil carbon is lower compared to the finer scale (Fig. 5b).

310 Table 1, 2 provides the estimates of the parameters of the spatial model along with the 95% confidence limits which is an indication of the uncertainty of the parameters. The estimated posterior parameters have narrow CI limits indicating the estimated mean provides a good approximation of the soil carbon content of the study area.

4.2 Spatial Disaggregation using Bayesian ATPRK

315
320 Fig. 6 displays the Bayesian ATPRK disaggregated soil carbon content of Nowley at 10m along with the 95% confidence interval limits. Unlike other methods which only give a single estimate of mean soil carbon content, the Bayesian technique provides a range/interval of the most probable value with a 95% confidence. These estimates are more reliable as they are generated using numerous repeated samplings. Accuracy and confidence in estimates are important parameters for planning, designing, and implementation of soil management. Therefore, Bayesian ATPRK provides a comprehensive output of soil carbon estimates at the farm scale.

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Line spacing: 1.5 lines

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

325

4.3 Comparison of Bayesian ATPRK and Dissever disaggregation methods

The disaggregated maps from both techniques were upscaled using a spatial overlay to assess the accuracy of disaggregation. CCC values were calculated for both techniques. Fig. 7 shows the agreement between the cell values of coarse map and the upscaled disaggregated maps.

Concordance correlation between original coarse values and upscaled product were 87% and 96% for Bayesian ATPRK and dissever, respectively. dissever iterates until the agreement between upscaled and original coarse cell reaches a set minimum, while Bayesian ATPRK output is a result of one simulation considering both the correlation with the covariates and covariance structure of the residuals. This explains the stronger concordance associated with dissever.

Fig.8 illustrates the comparison between dissever and Bayesian ATPRK disaggregated product with the coarse scale source map. A closer examination reveals that Bayesian ATPRK product resembles the spatial pattern of SOC more closely than the dissever product while dissever seemingly over predicts the SOC content.

Conversely, dissever is computationally more efficient compared to Bayesian ATPRK. Calculating the block to point and block to block distance matrixes is a computational expensive procedure. The whole study area cannot be computed in a single run using a desktop computer. Therefore, the study area has to be split into tiles, and predictions were carried out for each of the tiles. This resulted in abrupt changes between two tiles in the Bayesian ATPRK disaggregated map. ~~The use of parallel computing, high performing computing can improve the processing time.~~

4.4 Validation of Disaggregated maps

Independent validation results between disaggregated maps using dissever and Bayesian ATPRK indicate that Bayesian ATPRK technique is slightly more accurate compared to dissever produced output in general.

CCC value of Bayesian ATPRK was 23% while that of dissever was 18%. Greater CCC indicates more accurate and precise predictions. Mean squared error (MSE) of Bayesian ATPRK product was 0.45 while MSE for dissever was 0.49, which indicates that Bayesian ATPRK disaggregation is slightly more accurate than dissever disaggregation.

Although the validation CCC is low, it still is a sufficient approximation in terms of SOC as the SOC prediction accuracy generally remains low. The coarse map is a product of regression for the whole region, which also has a lower concordance correlation with the sampled data. Through the disaggregation process, the errors tend to propagate widening the gap between the actual and predicted SOC content.

Overall, we have demonstrated the use Bayesian ATPRK for downscaling coarse scale rasters to more informative fine scale rasters using available fine scale covariates. The study proves that Bayesian ATPRK provides more accurate results with uncertainty estimates of the disaggregation process. There are few limitations

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

370 of this study. Firstly, we did not deal with the uncertainty from all source of measurement errors. The coarse scale
map always carries a certain degree of error/uncertainty. Also, there is an uncertainty associated with the splining
of the maps. Both of these uncertainties can be treated as measurement errors and filtered by adding as a noise
variance along the diagonal of the covariance matrix C_{BB} . Another way of correcting the bias is to use the
measured data in the spatial model to reflect the actual ground conditions. Malone et al. 2017 demonstrated that
the inclusion of the ground observations improves the accuracy of the disaggregated maps. A further limitation
of our method is that the disaggregated map produced from Bayesian ATPRK has a block effect due to the final
map is a collection of tiles produced separately due to high computing demands of the model. This tiling effect
375 can be eliminated by using high performing and parallel computing solutions to generate the fine scale image at
one go. Also, low rank- representations (Wikle, 2010) of the covariance can also be used as possible solutions to
computational burden of the process.

380 Furthermore, although we have used the proposed Bayesian ATPRK in DSM domain, this method can
also be used to downscale coarse scale satellite data. Even though there is a wide range of fine resolution satellite
images available in present context, there is still sparsity of fine resolution data for certain parts of the world.
Spatial downscaling is a solution to this data sparsity. There is a range of disaggregation/ pan sharpening
techniques available in the literature. However, very few techniques can tackle the uncertainty of source images
and the uncertainty of the disaggregation process. Unlike other methods, Bayesian ATPRK can explicitly help to
385 tackle observation errors of the satellite images.

5 Conclusions -and Recommendations

The study demonstrates that Bayesian techniques can be effectively used to address the change of support problem.
Monte Carlo integration provides the estimates of point supported covariance structure using block supported data
390 along with uncertainty estimates of parameter inference. This study used informative priors of covariance
parameters as the soil carbon data were available for the study site. In the absence of prior information, priors
can be given as non-informative priors.

Bayesian ATPRK provides an effective way of disaggregating coarse scale SOC maps. The output of
this study facilitates policy making and soil management activities by providing the maps with confidence limits
395 which lead to wider understanding of the SOC content of the area. However, the method is computationally
expensive/intensive, and the use of high performing computing techniques is recommended for faster and smoother
predictions.

400 Further, the noise of coarse scale observation can be filtered through incorporating the noise variance in
the diagonal of C_{BB} . The use of point data (if available) in the spatial model can improve the accuracy of the
disaggregation. Finally, the use of both ~~of these~~ techniques is recommended for lower uncertainty and improved
accuracy of the disaggregation process.

Acknowledgements

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

405 The authors are grateful to the Australian Dep. of Agriculture, Round 2, Filling the Research Gap
Program for supporting this research (Grant No. 1194105-66). [Budiman Minasny is a member of a consortium
supported by LE STUDIUM Loire Valley Institute for Advanced Studies through its LE STUDIUM Research
Consortium Programme.](#) The authors extend thank [Prof. Gerard Heuvelink, from Wageningen University, and Dr.
Phuong Truong from University of Twente](#) for sharing ~~his~~ the R code on area to point kriging and providing
410 constructive insight to this paper. [Also, the authors are extending their acknowledgement to the two anonymous
reviewers who provided constructive comments for further improvements of this manuscript.](#)

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

415

References


- Akpa, S., Odeh, I., Bishop, T., Hartemink, A. and Amapu, I.: Total soil organic carbon and carbon sequestration potential in Nigeria, *Geoderma*, 271, 202-215, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2016.02.021, 2016.
- 420 Arrouays, D., McBratney, A. B., Minasny, B., Hempel, J. W., Heuvelink, G. B. M., MacMillan, R. A., Hartemink, A. E., Lagacherie, P. and McKenzie, N. J.: The GlobalSoilMap project specifications., *Glob. Basis Glob. Spat. Soil Inf. Syst.*, 2014.
- Bellon-Maurel, V., Fernandez-Ahumada, E., Palagos, B., Roger, J.-M. and McBratney, A.: Critical review of chemometric indicators commonly used for assessing the quality of the prediction of soil attributes by NIR spectroscopy, *TrAC Trends Anal. Chem.*, 29(9), 1073–1081, 2010.
- 425 Brus, D., Orton, T., Walvoort, D., Reijneveld, J. and Oenema, O.: Disaggregation of soil testing data on organic matter by the summary statistics approach to area-to-point kriging, *Geoderma*, 226-227, 151-159, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2014.02.011, 2014.
- 430 Cheng, Q.: Modeling Local Scaling Properties for Multiscale Mapping, *Vadose Zone Journal*, 7(2), 525, doi:10.2136/vzj2007.0034, 2008.
- 435 Cressie, N.: *Statistics for spatial data*, Wiley, New York., 1991.
- Cressie, N.: *Statistics for spatial data*, Wiley, Hoboken, N.J., 2011.
- de Brogniez, D., Ballabio, C., Stevens, A., Jones, R., Montanarella, L. and van Wesemael, B.: A map of the topsoil organic carbon content of Europe generated by a generalized additive model, *European Journal of Soil Science*, 66(1), 121-134, doi:10.1111/ejss.12193, 2014.
- 440

- de Brogniez, D., Ballabio, C., Stevens, A., Jones, R., Montanarella, L. and van Wesemael, B.: A map of the topsoil organic carbon content of Europe generated by a generalized additive model, *European Journal of Soil Science*, 66(1), 121-134, doi:10.1111/ejss.12193, 2014.
- 445
- de Gruijter, J., McBratney, A., Minasny, B., Wheeler, I., Malone, B. and Stockmann, U.: Farm-scale soil carbon auditing, *Geoderma*, 265, 120-130, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2015.11.010, 2016.
- 450
- De Gruijter, J., Minasny, B. and Mcbratney, A.: Optimizing Stratification and Allocation for Design-Based Estimation of Spatial Means Using Predictions with Error, *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology*, 3(1), 19-42, doi:10.1093/jssam/smu024, 2015.
- Diggle, P., Tawn, J. and Moyeed, R.: Model-based geostatistics, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*, 47(3), 299-350, doi:10.1111/1467-9876.00113, 2002.
- 455
- Draper, D.: Assessment and Propagation of Model Uncertainty, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 57(1), 45-70, doi:10.1111/j.2517-6161.1995.tb02015.x, 1995
- .
- 460
- Finke, P. A., Bierkens, M. F. P., Steenvoorden, F. and Claessen, J.: Choosing appropriate upscaling and downscaling methods for environmental research., *J Willems Eds Agric. Eff. Gr. Surf. Waters Res. Edge Sci. Soc. Iahs Publ.* pp. 405-409, 2002.
- Gelfand, A.: On the change of support problem for spatio-temporal data, *Biostatistics*, 2(1), 31-45, doi:10.1093/biostatistics/2.1.31, 2001.
- 465
- Goovaerts, P.: Kriging and semivariogram deconvolution in the presence of irregular geographical units, *Math. Geosci.*, 40(1), 101-128, 2008.
- 470
- Goovaerts, P.: A coherent geostatistical approach for combining choropleth map and field data in the spatial interpolation of soil properties, *Eur. J. Soil Sci.*, 62(3), 371-380, 2011.
- Gotway, C. A. and Young, L. J.: Combining incompatible spatial data., *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 97(458), 632-648, 2002.
- 475
- Gotway, C. A. and Young, L. J.: A geostatistical approach to linking geographically aggregated data from different sources, *J. Comput. Graph. Stat.*, 16(1), 115-135, 2007.
- Grundy, M., Rossel, R. V., Searle, R., Wilson, P., Chen, C. and Gregory, L.: Soil and landscape grid of Australia., *Soil Res.*, 53(8), 835-844, 2015.
- 480
- Grunwald, S.: Multi-criteria characterization of recent digital soil mapping and modeling approaches., *Geoderma* 152 195207, 3-4, 2009.

- 485 Heuvelink, G. B. M.: Uncertainty analysis in environmental modelling under a change of spatial scale, in *Soil and Water Quality at Different Scales*, pp. 255–264, Springer., 1998.
- Kerry, R., Goovaerts, P., Rawlins, B. G. and Marchant, B. P.: Disaggregation of legacy soil data using area to point kriging for mapping soil organic carbon at the regional scale, *Geoderma*, 170, 347–358, 2012.
- 490 Kyriakidis, P. C.: A geostatistical framework for area-to-point spatial interpolation, *Geogr. Anal.*, 36(3), 259–289, 2004.
- Lagacherie, P.: Digital soil mapping: a state of the art, in *Digital soil mapping with limited data*, pp. 3–14, Springer., 2008.
- 495 Lawrence, I. and Lin, K.: A concordance correlation coefficient to evaluate reproducibility, *Biometrics*, 255–268, 1989.
- Liu, D.S., Pu, R.L., 2008. Downscaling thermal infrared radiance for subpixel land surface temperature retrieval. *Sensors* 8(4), 2695-2706.
- 500 Malone, B. P., McBratney, A. B. and Minasny, B.: Spatial scaling for digital soil mapping, *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 77(3), 890–902, 2013.
- 505 Malone, B. P., McBratney, A. B., Minasny, B. and Laslett, G. M.: Mapping continuous depth functions of soil carbon storage and available water capacity., *Geoderma* 154 138152, 1–2, 2009.
- Malone, B. P., Styc, Q., Minasny, B. and McBratney, A. B.: Digital soil mapping of soil carbon at the farm scale: A spatial downscaling approach in consideration of measured and uncertain data., *Geoderma*, 290, 91–99, 2017.
- 510 McBratney, A. B.: Some considerations on methods for spatially aggregating and disaggregating soil information., *Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosystems* 50 5162, 1–3, 1998.
- McBratney, A. B., Santos, M. L. M. and Minasny, B.: On digital soil mapping, *Geoderma*, 117(1–2), 3–52, 2003.
- 515 Minasny, B., McBratney, A. B. and Part, B.: Digital soil mapping: A brief history and some lessons., *Geoderma* 264, 301–311, 2016.
- Minty, B., Franklin, R., Milligan, P., Richardson, M. and Wilford, J.: The radiometric map of Australia, *Explor. Geophys.*, 40(4), 325–333, 2009.
- 520 Mulder, V. L., Lacoste, M., Richer-de-Forges, A. C. and Arrouays, D.: GlobalSoilMap France: High-resolution spatial modelling the soils of France up to two meter depth, *Sci. Total Environ.*, 573, 1352–1369, 2016.


- Nagle, N. N., Sweeney, S. H. and Kyriakidis, P. C.: A Geostatistical Linear Regression Model for Small Area Data. *Geogr. Anal.*, 43(1), 38–60, 2011.
- 525
- Ogders, N. P., Sun, W., McBratney, A. B., Minasny, B. and Clifford, D.: Disaggregating and harmonising soil map units through resampled classification trees., *Geoderma*, 214, 91–100, 2014.
- Panagos, P., Liedekerke, M. and Montanarella, L.: Van . Multi-scale European Soil Information System (MEUSIS): a multi-scale method to derive soil indicators., *Comput. Geosci.*, 15(3), 463–475, 2011.
- 530
- Pardo-Igúzquiza, E. and Atkinson, P. M.: Modelling the semivariograms and cross-semivariograms required in downscaling cokriging by numerical convolution–deconvolution, *Comput. Geosci.*, 33(10), 1273–1284, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cageo.2007.05.004>, 2007.
- 535
- Reid, Alistair; Ramos, Fabio; Sukkarieh, S.: Bayesian Fusion for Multi-Modal Aerial Images, in *Robotics: Science and Systems.*, 2013.
- Román Dobarco, M., T. G. Orton, D. Arrouays, B. Lemerrier, J.-B. Paroissien, C. Walter and N. P. A. Saby (2016). "Prediction of soil texture using descriptive statistics and area-to-point kriging in Region Centre (France)." *Geoderma Regional* 7(3): 279-292.
- Roudier, P., Malone, B. P., Hedley, C. B., Minasny, B. and McBratney, A. B.: Comparison of regression methods for spatial downscaling of soil organic carbon stocks maps, *Comput. Electron. Agric.*, 142, 91–100, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2017.08.021>, 2017.
- 545
- Somarathna, P. D. S. N., Malone, B. P. and Minasny, B.: Mapping soil organic carbon content over New South Wales, Australia using local regression kriging, *Geoderma Reg.*, 7(1), 38–48, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geodrs.2015.12.002>, 2016.
- 550
- Truong, P. N., Heuvelink, G. B. M. and Pebesma, E.: Bayesian area-to-point kriging using expert knowledge as informative priors, *Int. J. Appl. Earth Obs. Geoinf.*, 30, 128–138, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2014.01.019>, 2014.
- Wagenet, R. J.: Scale issues in agroecological research chains., *Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosystems* 50 2334, 1–3, 1998.
- 555
- Wang, Q., Shi, W., Atkinson, P. M. and Zhao, Y.: Downscaling MODIS images with area-to-point regression kriging, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 166, 191–204, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2015.06.003>, 2015.

565



570 [Wikle, C.K., 2010. Low-rank representations for spatial processes, in: Handbook of Spatial Statistics. CRC Press, pp. 114–125.](#)

575



580 [Figure 1: The study area \(left\) \(Sources: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, i-cubed, USDA FSA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community\) and the coarse scale topsoil soil organic carbon map \(right\).](#)




Figure 2: Block support experimental variogram of the coarse scale (100 m resolution) soil carbon map.




Figure 3: Schematic representation of diserver disaggregation technique.







Figure 4: Correlations and posterior distribution of linear trends parameters of the spatial model.



a. Formatted: Right



610

615

b Formatted: Right







Figure 5: (a) Correlations and posterior distribution of variogram parameters (b) and the point and block support variograms.

620

625




630 Figure 6: Bayesian ATPRK disaggregated map with the 95% confidence limits.



640

Figure 7: Correlation plots between upscaled disaggregated values from Bayesian ATPRK, disserver and original coarse scale block values.



645

Figure 8: Comparing the disaggregated map with original coarse scale SOC map.

650

655

Table 1. Posterior parameters of the linear trend model.

	β_0	β_1	β_2	β_3	β_4	β_5	β_6
Lower CI limit	1.360	-0.003	-0.291	-0.045	0.002	-0.019	-0.030
Mean	1.416	0.002	-0.281	-0.040	0.007	-0.014	-0.024
Upper CI limit	1.471	0.007	-0.270	-0.034	0.012	-0.009	-0.018

$\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5$ and β_6 are the coefficients of the linear trend for intercept, elevation, TWI, gamma radiometric thorium, gamma radiometric potassium, Landsat band 4 and Landsat band 7 parameters respectively.

660

Table 2. Posterior parameters of the point support Matern variogram model.

Method	Nugget	sill	range	smoothness
Lower CI limit	-0.05	-0.02	759.10	0.45
Mean	0.005	0.034	788.24	0.50
Upper CI limit	0.06	0.09	817.37	0.57

665

670


675

680

685

690

695



700 **Response to Reviewer's comments**

We would like to thank the reviewers for providing constructive comments and efforts towards improving this manuscript. We highlight the reviewers' comments in red and our responses are given in black.

Reviewer 1 comments and Responses

705 **General comments:** This manuscript proposed the use of Bayesian Area-to-Point Regression Kriging (ATPRK) for spatial disaggregation of regional scale digital soil map to farm scale. This method is able to provide the uncertainty estimate associated with the disaggregation process. Throughout it had lower concordance correlation with the coarse map than dissever algorithm, the independent data showed that Bayesian ATPRK had a higher concordance correlation than dissever. Generally, the proposed method is interesting as it can provide the uncertainty related to the disaggregation process. However, from my point of view, the major uncertainty of
710 disaggregated map comes from the original map, thus it is more important to incorporate the uncertainty of the original map into disaggregation. Is the proposed method able to integrate this? Another limitation is the Results and Discussion section, where authors focused mostly on the results and rarely provided a more general discussion. I look forward to seeing the feedback from the authors on these two issues

715 We have identified the uncertainty of the original should also be considered in the disaggregation process. We have mentioned this in our conclusions section as a recommendation. Our main focus of this paper was to estimate the uncertainty of the disaggregation process which is overly neglected in the current literature. However, the proposed Bayesian method is capable of handling the uncertainty of the original map by incorporating the uncertainty as a noise variance in the covariance matrix. C_{BB} . This enables filtering the noise. Also, we have added
720 more detailed discussion about filtering measurement errors. (lines 341 -348)

Another limitation is the Results and Discussion section, where authors focused mostly on the results and rarely provided a more general discussion.

We agree with the reviewer that the discussion section should be little more generalised. Therefore, a more generalised discussion was added at the of the results and discussion section (lines 341 -361).

725

Specific comments: Line 21: Why only mentioned underestimation? How about overestimation?

Here we are referring to the fact that in DSM literature the uncertainty estimates of the disaggregation process are often neglected.

730 **Line 35:** What is the difference in computing time? I know Bayesian ATPRK is a one-step process, and it saves computing time? Because sometimes an iteration process can also be efficient.

The difference in computing time is approximately 3 hrs

Line 45: It is not "five standard soil depths" but "six standard depth intervals".

The typo was corrected

Lines 71-72: I do not agree with the statement here, DSMART can also produce maps in a fine grid.

735 Here, we are referring to the fine riding process where we disaggregated a coarse grid cell (100m) into many (10 x 10) fine grid cells. While the rasters created by DSMART based on the most probable class assigned after generating realisations from classification trees. The classification trees are built using the values taken from random samples from each soil class polygon from the legacy maps.

740 Line 123: What do you mean “at N point”? Line 136: Since you listed many methods for deconvolution of the empirical variogram, it is better to show here why you chose Bayesian estimation.

We have included the objective of choosing Bayesian techniques to infer the point support variogram. (line 137-138)

Lines 187-189: Do you think the proposed framework can integrate the uncertainty from the fitted mass-preserving splines as well as from the uncertainty estimates associated to these two SOC maps (0-5, 5-15 cm)?

745 Yes, the uncertainty from all sources can be accounted using the proposed Bayesian techniques. This is also included in the added new section to the results and discussion section.

I understand that the Bayesian ATPRK can provide the uncertainty in the step of disaggregation, however, I think the major uncertainty comes from the original map, which should be not ignored in disaggregation.

750 We have identified this as a limitation of the study, and it was further elaborated in this revised version (line 341-361.)

Lines 196-197: Why you choose 10 m as the final resolution? The finest covariate used here is in 10 m (Elevation data), I think you should mention it in the very beginning.

755 There were two reasons behind choosing 10m as the fine resolution. One is the resolution of available data at fine scale and secondly, we believe that 10m maps are informative enough for supporting decision making process at fine scale. In anotherword, 10m maps would capture most of the spatial variability of SOC and therefore we selected 10m as our fine scale’s resolution.

Line 268: I suggest adding PICP to assess the uncertainty.

We present CI estimates of model parameters and maps. CI values provide an insight to the uncertainty estimates.

760 Therefore, we decided not to include PICPs

Lines 341-342: reduce the processing time? However, parallel computing can still not solve abrupt changes between two tiles. Maybe you need a laptop with larger RAM?

Yes, it needs a bigger RAM to disaggregate the whole study area at once.

765 Line 579: Figure 6 still showed an obvious block effect. In order to compare the original SOC map (Figure 1), please use the same legend and then we can tell the difference between them.

Figure 1 was changed to the same legend.

Line 595: The map from Disserver looks smoother.

Disserver disaggregate the whole study area at once resulting a smoother map. Therefore, the maps are smoother.

770 Technical corrections Line 21: DSM has not been defined in the previous texts. Line 48: DSM has been defined before.

Respective corrections were made.

Line 91: SOC has not been defined yet.

SOC defined

775 Line 200: C2 SOILD Interactive comment Printer-friendly version Discussion paper DEM has not been defined yet and Topographic Wetness Index can be replaced by TWI here.

DEM was defined and the Topographic Wetness Index was replaced by TWI

Line 209: and should not be in italic. Please have a careful check of all the parameters which should be in italic.

Line 260: In “cm²”, 2 should be in superscript.

Respective corrections were made

780 Line 280: predicted SOC values.

Typo was corrected

Line 285: LMM has not been defined.

LMM was defined

Line 290: In other texts, dissever is used. Please make it consistent.

785 Line 539: Please use either Figure or Fig. in the text. Currently, it is a mix.

The term "Figure" has been used as the title of figures while "Fig." was used in the text when the figures are described

Line 565: Better to put (a) and (b) in the upper right position.

Changed the positions of a and b

790

Reviewer 2 comments and responses

The manuscript is well-written and follows up from earlier work of Malone et al. 2017 on disaggregation of coarse scale SOC maps. This is particular important for facilitating management at the field/farm scale. Although I am not a geostatistical expert, the data analysis is sound and the results are convincing, although not much different from the ones obtained by the 'dissever' approach.

795

Lines 19-20 Is not there a verb missing in the sentence starting with 'Disaggregating' ?

The typo was corrected

Line 21 Define 'DSM' at first time use.

DSM was defined

800 Line 52 I appreciate that you try to use the original meaning of scale 'large' and 'small', but the word 'or' might create confusion. How about replacing 'or' by 'i.e.'?

Line 53 ..into two categories. . .

Typo was corrected

Line 62 Please rephrase this sentence and break it up. e.g. They demonstrated that a Gaussian process model can be used as a novel image fusion technique. They used images from unmanned aerial vehicle flown over agricultural fields for panchromatic sharpening of low-resolution satellite images.

805

The sentence was rephrased.

All the following typos were corrected.

Line 65 Avoid using 'approach' twice in one sentence.

810 Please rephrase line 74 are not there some commas missing?

Line 79 ..and also ancillary covariates such as the 'scorpan factors' (McBratney et al., 2003; Kerry et al., 2012).

Line 83 . . .underlying..

Line 89 ..soil organic carbon (SOC^o maps.. SOC is arguably. . .

Line 236 . . .approach. . .

815 Line 264 Specify the manufacturer and the country for the Variomax. Did you check the samples for inorganic carbon (carbonates)?

Line 285 Has 'LMM' been defined before? Avoid using 'model' twice in one sentence.

Line 351 The MSE has units.

