

Interactive comment on “Global concentrations of microplastic in soils, a review” by Frederick Büks and Martin Kaupenjohann

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 4 November 2020

The authors discuss microplastic contamination and detail several limitations of methods currently in use. They raise several complementary research questions that should be tackled in future. Generally, the article is beautifully written. The idea of the article is original, figures and tables are clear. I recommend this article for publishing after some minor modifications: Line 85 “The aim of this review is to collect data about common soil MP concentrations, sizes, shapes and types under the influence of different anthropogenic parameters.” I think the article goes further so I suggest improving this sentence. Based on the authors experience: could they add a table summarizing the pros and cons of each method for measuring MP in the soil. Line 365 -370 “. . .which increase with the number of sewage sludge applications (Corradini et al., 2019; Crossman et al., 2020; van den Berg et al., 2020)”. What is the frequency of sewage adding?

C1

Line 438 “. . .Only 15 % of the sites are described sufficiently by means of soil texture or soil type..” Was there any other information about soil characteristic beside texture, such as carbon concentration, macro-micro fauna activity, . . .? and how each parameter could be linked to MP concentration? If so it would be interesting to mention it if such data exists in the literature. I’m again sincerely grateful to the authors for providing such a high quality of research, the article was pleasant to read, well organized, and educational.

Interactive comment on SOIL Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/soil-2020-50>, 2020.

C2