

Topical editor comments to manuscript essd-2020-149 by Gupta et al. (Version of 22nd December 2020)

Comments are referring to the manuscript version containing the tracked changes

P3L19/20: I agree with referee 1 that the search keywords should be listed explicitly. So if the keywords were the three that you mention in the text, please remove the “like” in the sentence, if there were more keywords, please name them.

P5L6: As referee 1 suggested, please specify how many smaller studies you included (not “several”). It helps to put the numbers of measurements for these regions into perspective.

P5L10: “Completeness assessment”: you mention in your response to referee 2 that you use “completeless assessment” instead of “quality assignment” and why you do that. But I do not see any description of a completeness assessment in section 2.2. What exactly does it entail and where does it enter the database? As for the position accuracy: It would be good to have a clear indication which dataset was subject to which method to determine the position accuracy, at least somewhere in the metadata. Which had to be guessed from Google Maps, which was provided in the study...? Did I simply not find this so far or isn’t it listed yet?

P6L13: Number of outliers. Please follow referee 1’s comment and state the explicit number of removed outliers.

P9 Table 4: I agree with referee 2 that the field methods in Table 4 are not very well structured. If you already refer to the classification in Rahmati et al. 2018, why don’t you also stick to the structure they have in their Table 7?

P11L1-L3: These two sentences are unclear. Please be specific what test you did (ANOVA with which post-hoc test?) and why. This also refers to P13L1.

Other remarks:

- 1) Supplement:
 - As you refer to the supplement tables explicitly within the text, I suggest you attach both supplements simply as Appendix A and B to the main manuscript, so that they can be found more easily.
 - Also, the supplement file containing the tables lacks description of the tests that are the basis for the significance values (probably the ANOVA with which post-hoc test?). Please add this information to the captions. Also maybe rethink the wording as you are probably testing if there are “(significant) differences in Ksat between the texture classes” and probably not the “significance between texture classes”.
- 2) Zenodo: “sol_ksat.pnts_metadata.csv”: Please make sure the Ksat method names are the same as the ones in the list in Table 4. This makes it much easier to follow which methods have been used throughout both the database and the manuscript.
- 3) Please also check again for typos. I stumbled upon a few but will not go through the whole manuscript to point them out.