

Interactive comment on “CHLSOC: The Chilean Soil Organic Carbon database, a multi-institutional collaborative effort” by Marco Pfeiffer et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 24 November 2019

I have read through the manuscript "CHLSOC: The Chilean Soil Organic Carbon database, a multi-institutional collaborative effort" submitted to ESSD. The CHISOC dataset compiled a huge amount of SOC data, which is an important data resource. I think the database could be published in your Journal.

I am interested to see how consistency between this data and some global soil organic carbon datasets, for example: The HWSO has SOC data, please see their data at: https://daac.ornl.gov/cgi-bin/dsvviewer.pl?ds_id=1247 The updated global carbon map: https://esdac.jrc.ec.europa.eu/ESDB_Archive/octop/Resources/Global_OC_Poster.pdf It should be easy to link your dataset (by latitude and longitude) with above two datasets, and analyze the consistency between them.

This will be a great contribution to evaluate the data quality of global SOC datasets;

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



meanwhile, it is also a good way to evaluate the quality of CHISOC.

Specific comments Abstract Line 2: do you mean both “soil and SOC data” are highly concentrated in 25% of the territory, or do you mean “soil SOC data”? In my opinion, it makes more sense to say “soil SOC data”. Please check. Line 7: “difinçult to access data” sounds not the best expression, change to “inaccessible data”? But I am not a native English speaker, please check with the native speaker.

Introduction Line 2: “the contents and dynamics of the SOC stock is pool is are essential to. . .” please check this sentence. Line 3: “atmospheric CO2 content s to be used as an input”, there is a space in the word “content s”, please delete it.

Figure Figure 2. I can understand why before 2005, there are not much data. But why 2007, 2008, and 2009 do not have many data?

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-161>, 2019.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

