

# ***Interactive comment on “Calcium content and high calcium adaptation of plants in karst areas of southwestern Hunan, China” by Xiaocong Wei et al.***

## **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 3 January 2018

### My comment

The manuscript, “Calcium content and high calcium adaptation of plants in karst areas of southwestern Hunan, China” was intended to investigate plant Ca content, soil exchangeable Ca and total Ca content on the rocky desertification areas in southwestern China. The present project is important and interested for us to better understanding of differences of Ca content in plants and soil resulted from the grades of rocky desertification. The contents of this manuscript is meet the scopes of the Journal of “Biogeosciences” for publication very well. However, there are some shortcomings in the manuscript, which prevents it from publishing the present version in this journal.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



The structure and organization of sentences in the manuscript are not appropriately written, which are confused by readers. The Results and Discussion sections should not be mixed together in writing and these two sections should be separated in the manuscript. Authors should not present any explanations in the Results section, and the similar errors are appeared in the Discussion section. Therefore, I suggest the manuscript be accepted after major revise. I provide my comments in detail as follow- ing for consideration when the manuscript is revised.

1. Abstract: P1 L13 removes the sentence “However, the Ca<sup>2+</sup> dynamics of plants and soil are not well understood” into the P4 L10 P1 L14 deletes the s from the “samples” P1 L16 “slop” should be slope Reword all words “underground” into belowground in the entire manuscript

2. Introduction P2 L2: use provides to replace “can provide” P2 L8: delete “Of course” Change the sentence “the severity of rocky desertification in Hunan Province was ranked fourth (Li et al., 2016) into” The severity of rocky desertification was ranked in fourth in Hunan Province of China (Li et al., 2016) P2 L9: Insert the “Rocky deser- tification is an extreme form of land degradation in karst areas, and 10 has become a major social problem in terms of China’s economic and social development (Sheng et al., 2015)” should be before ”The severity of rocky desertification was ranked in fourth in Hunan Province of China (Li et al., 2016)” P2 L110-12: Change the “The restora- tion and reconstruction of rocky desertification ecosystems has become the immediate focus of agro-forestry production environment improvements, regional economic de- velopment and helping to support people out of poverty (Jing et al., 2016)” into “The restoration and reconstruction of rocky desertification ecosystems have become the ur- gent environment improvements, regional economic development by using agroforestry system and helping to support people out of poverty (Jing et al., 2016). P2L13 “soil with high Ca” P2L14-15: rewrite “From the origin of rocky desertification, 15 the restoration of vegetation is key to the process of remediation (Wang et al., 2004). Consequently, the screening of plants which can grow successfully in high- calcium environments is

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

an extremely critical step.” P3L2: Change “Ca<sup>2+</sup> and pectin in the cell walls of plants combine” into: “Ca<sup>2+</sup> combine with pectin in the cell walls of plants” P3L11: change “than cannot” into “not” P4L3-L4 “Ji et al. (2009) revealed that the mean soil ECa was 3.61 gÂkg<sup>-1</sup> in the Puding, Huajing, Libo and Luodian Counties of Guizhou Province, which is several times that of non-limestone areas in China.” should be: “The mean soil ECa was 3.61 gÂkg<sup>-1</sup> in the Puding, Huajing, Libo and Luodian Counties of Guizhou Province, which is several times that of non-limestone areas in China (Ji et al. 2009). P4L7-L19 “These results indicate that there are differences in soil Ca content between different areas and that there are differences between calcareous and non-calcareous plants in terms of Ca absorption, transport and storage and other physiological processes. Collectively, these differences lead to different degrees of adaptability of plants to high Ca environments.” Should be “There are variations in soil Ca content among different areas and differences between calcareous and non-calcareous plants in terms of Ca absorption, transport and storage and other physiological processes. These differences need to identify the variety of the plants to adapt with high Ca environments.” P4L10-L11 delete “there is a scarcity of extensive research into” should be” the mechanisms by which plants adapt to high Ca conditions, particularly in karst areas and the Ca<sup>2+</sup> dynamics of plants and soil are not well understood. P4L14: delete “In order to”, capitalize the “To” P4L15 “we did the following:” should be “the following investigations were explored”

3. Materials and methods P5: site description is too simple, should add more information regarding to the study, e.g. slope, soil pH, soil properties, and vegetation cover P5L4 title “Data collection” should be “Experimental design and data collection” P5L6 delete “period. These four main indices” P5L9-L10: delete” a range of 10 characteristics and data relating to the surrounding environment”, add “environmental factors” P5L11: “We conducted a detailed survey of the three sample areas and collected samples in October 2016.” Should be “The sample collection in these three sample areas were conducted in October 2016. “ P5L13: use “Within” to replace the “For” P5L14: add were set up after “(upper, middle, and lower slope)” P5L14-L15: add (3x4x3) were set

up before the “for analysis”, delete “We chose to study” and “the common plant species of the region, 15 and gathered plants using the whole plant harvest method. In each small quadrat, every kind of shrubs and herbs are collected.” Should be “The common plant species of the region were gathered using the whole plant harvest method in each small quadrat as well as all shrubs and herbs are collected.” P5L17: “heated” should be “oven tried” P5L18: add “and after” after the de-enzyme” P5L18: not clear, “constant weight at 80oC, L 17 you mentioned 105oC, why? Rewrite it P5L18: delete “and bagged” and add “chemical” before the “analysis” P5L20: delete “Finally” add “were sampled” P6L5: “biennial herbs, while ‘deciduous shrubs’ included deciduous trees with a height less than 2 m or a ground diameter less than 3 cm.” not clear, rewrite P6L8-L9: “One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), Two-way ANOVA and Pearson correlation analysis ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) were used to analyze the Ca content of soil and plants within and between different grades of rocky desertification.” Not clear, rewrite it

4. Results P6L13: add in soil after “The mean TCa content” P6L14: Use “location” to replace “points” P6L15: delete “Furthermore”, and add “The”, and to use “that” replacing “to be” P6L17: Add “Ca content” after: “average”, and use “the” to replace “with” P6L21: Use “Total” to replace “The” P7L1: use “.” To replace “,”, and then use “Compare to” to replace “while” P7L3: delete “when compared across”, to use “throughout” P7L4: “aboveground” add “and belowground”, and delete “or that of underground parts, there” P7L5: Delete the whole sentence “Furthermore, the grades of rocky desertification had no obvious effect on the Ca content of the aboveground and underground parts of the plants generally (Fig. 2).” P7L8: “The 41 plant species were identified in the 36 small quadrats; these plants were divided into different functional groups” should be “The 41 plant species were identified and were divided into different functional groups in the 36 small quadrats.” P7L8-L9: delete “For each functional group,” add “The” before Ca P7L9-L10: “Ca content between the aboveground and underground parts were significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ), and 10 the Ca content of the aboveground parts was higher than that of the underground parts ( $p < 0.05$ )” should be “The Ca content of the aboveground parts significantly was higher than that of the

[Printer-friendly version](#)
[Discussion paper](#)


belowground parts in each group ( $p < 0.05$ )” P7L15-L16: “In terms of life form functional groups, shrubs showed a significantly higher Ca content, both aboveground and underground than herbs ( $p < 0.05$ )” should be “In life form functional groups, shrubs showed a significantly higher in Ca content than herbs in both aboveground and underground ( $p < 0.05$ )” P7L18: “The aboveground and underground Ca content of dicotyledons” should be “The Ca content of dicotyledons in aboveground and belowground parts” P7L21-23: “In terms of monocotyledons and dicotyledons, further analysis revealed no significant differences in the Ca content of the aboveground parts when compared between the different grades of rocky desertification; this was also true for the Ca content of the underground parts.” Its not clear, rewrite it P7L23: Delete “The Ca content of both the aboveground and underground parts of monocotyledons was always low while those of dicotyledons were always high” P8L1-2 “The Ca content of dicotyledons was significantly higher than those of monocotyledons across” should be “The Ca content of dicotyledons in both of was significantly higher than those of monocotyledons in both aboveground and belowground parts throughout” P8L3: “For the 41 common plants collected, 17 plant species (which exist in each sample area) were widespread throughout the southwestern rocky desertification areas of Hunan.” Should be “Within total 41 common plants species, 17 plant species were found in each sample plot and were widespread throughout the southwestern rocky desertification areas of Hunan.” P8L5: Delete “For each of t”, capitalize “T” P8L3: use were calculated replace “we calculated” P8L5: Delete “. These plants were common species in the local area” P8L5-“We carried out two-way ANOVA for both species and soil for these 17 plants to determine differences in plant Ca content” should be moved to the data analysis part, not in the results part P8L6: Delete “. The soil was graded into three categories: LRD, MRD and IRD.” P8L7: Delete “df=16, F=11.277” P8L8: Use “related among” to replace “significant among the different P9L9: (df=2, F=2.299, p=0.117) P8L9: “The” Ca not For “Ca”, delete “differences” P8L10: Use “among the species”, delete “(df=16, F=8.543, p<0.01)”, and delete “but also among the different” and it throughout all the”, and delete “df=2, F=4.104,” P8L12-13: “The correlation between plant Ca content and

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

soil ECa content reflects what extent soil Ca content influences plant Ca content, and may also reflect how different plants respond to differences in soil ECa content” this sentence should not in results part, may be in discussion section. P8L13: Too many “For this” and “In terms of”, delete them. P8L15: “which indicated that *Sanguisorba officinalis* was affected greatly by soil ECa conten” should be not in the results section. P8L17: “indicating that the underground parts of these species were also greatly affected by soil ECa content.” should be not in the results section. P8L19” which indicated that the aboveground parts of *Themeda japonica* was also greatly affected by soil ECa 20 content” should be not in the results section P9L2: Delete “kinds of” P9L3: “and were also the representative species that are able to adapt to a high Ca soil environment.” How do you know it? Suggest to delete it P9L6-9: “The capacity of these plants which are able to adapt to high Ca soil environments can be reflected by two indicators: (i) the correlation between Ca content in the aboveground parts of the plants and soil ECa content; (ii) the species differences in terms of the Ca content of the aboveground parts of plants. Thus, based on the above two indicators, we classified these plants into the following groups: Ca-indifferent plants, high-Ca plants and low-Ca plants (Ji et al., 2009).” This should be moved to the discussion section. Results just present your results, no explanation and citation. P9L10: The definition “Ca-indifferent plants” is it correct? P9L12:” The Ca content of these plants increased or decreased correspondingly with increases or reductions in soil ECa content, but plant growth was not affected by such changes.” Not clear, rewrite it P9L17: “High-Ca plants”, refer it “high Ca demand plants P9L20: “Moreover, the physiological activities of these plants had a higher demand for Ca and may have a strong ability to enrich soil Ca.” should be in the discussion part P9L21: “Low-Ca plants” should be Low Ca demand plants P9L23: Why do you use “19g/kg” as the boundary to determine the low or high Ca demand plants? P10L2-5: the whole paragraph should belong to the discussion, not in the results. Again, the results should just present your results, do not need any explanation in this part, any explanation and citation should be in the discussion section.

5. Discussion P10L9: delete “The aboveground parts of plants had a higher Ca con-

tent than the underground 10 parts, although” P10L10: Capitalize T (The), delete when compared P10L17: period after the (2014), and then separate the paragraph P10L18: What is the ABC soil? P10L18: “Tanikawa et al. (2017) revealed that concentrations of TCa and ECa were also low at the deeper horizons in the low-acid buffering capacity  $\text{ABC}$  soils, and pointed to differences in both organic layer thickness and soil chemistry as a reason for affecting Ca accumulation of low- and 20 high-ABC stands” is unclear, rewrite it P11L1: Add “compared to the aboveground and belowground Ca content in our study,” before the “The”, and then use lowercase of “t” P11L3: “,” should be “.” P11L1-4: “The maximum and minimum calcium content of plant aboveground parts were  $41.79 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$  and  $2.15 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$  respectively, and the maximum and minimum calcium content of plant underground parts were  $40.14 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$  and  $0.42 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$  respectively, Which is lower than the calcium content of calcareous plants leaves (maximum  $85.13 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$  minimum  $6.26 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$ ) by Luo et al. (2014).” Aboveground includes leaves and branches, how do you compared with leaves only? Ca presents the Calcium, should keep the constant in the manuscript. P11L9: The beginning of the paragraph should present your research results pattern first, and then discuss and explain it. P11L11: Use “had a” to replace “was extremely”. Use “.” and delete “and” to separate the sentence. The sentence “our results showed several plants (*Sanguisorba officinalis*, *Dendranthema indicum*, *Castanea henryi* and *Themeda japonica* ) and soil Eca content was a positive correlation, but most plant calcium content and soil ECa content was not relevant.” Should be “Our results showed that most plants had no correlation relationship between soil ECa and plant Ca excepting several plant (*Sanguisorba officinalis*, *Dendranthema indicum*, *Castanea henryi* and *Themeda japonica* ) had a positive correlation between soil Eca and plant Ca content.” P11L14: what are “species-related factors,”? Do you mean plant species physiological factors? P11L15-16: “was in accordance with data reported previously by Ji et al. (2009).” should be “was supported with data reported by Ji et al. (2009).” P11L17: “Since the transport of Ca was mainly one-way (upward), this result indicated that nitrogen-fixing plants were the most efficient in terms of the upward transport of Ca,

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

and that Ca was mainly concentrated in the aboveground parts of the plant; these findings were not consistent with those of Ji et al. (2009).” Is not clear, rewrite it. P11L19: delete “In the paper” P11L20: “.” after Ca, The sentence” and studied only three types of plants (pteridophytes, dicotyledons, monocotyledons) that did not include nitrogen-fixing plants, which may be the reason for the inconsistency of this previous data with our current findings.” Should be” They used three types of plants (pteridophytes, dicotyledons, monocotyledons) exclude nitrogen-fixing plants in their study, which may have a conflicting result compared with our current findings.” P11L22-P12L1: delete “in terms of”, the sentence “In terms of the Ca content of monocotyledons, we found significant differences ( $p < 0.01$ ) between the aboveground and underground parts, but the study by Ji et al. (2009) revealed that these differences were not significant. This may be because most of the monocotyledons collected were low-Ca plants.” should be”We found significant differences ( $p < 0.01$ ) between the aboveground and belowground parts in Ca content of monocotyledons in our study. However, Ji et al. (2009) revealed that no significant differences between the aboveground and belowground parts in Ca content of monocotyledons. This phenomenon may contribute the most of the monocotyledons sample plants were low-Ca demand plants.” P12L2-3: “Owing to the fact that the aboveground parts of low-Ca plants maintain a lower Ca content for different grades of rocky desertification, a significant difference was found between the aboveground and underground parts in monocotyledons. In addition, the Ca content of monocotyledons was lower than that reported for monocotyledons (Ji et al., 2009),” is not clear, rewrite it P12L7-8: “Over the past decade, progress has been made in identifying the cellular compartments (e.g., endoplasmic reticulum, chloroplasts and mitochondria) that regulate Ca balance and signal transduction in plants (Müller et al., 2015). “ may move to the introduction section. P12L8-P13L14: again, authors should present the results pattern at the beginning of the discussion to explain your results. This paragraph should be rewritten. Lots of “in terms of” showed in the manuscript, delete them. In this paragraph, I did not see any results at the beginning of the discussion. The discussion is used to explain the results P13L15-22: suggest deleting

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)



the paragraph because it does not make sense in your discussion, as well as so many times to cite the literature Ji et al (2009)

6. Conclusions P13L5 “Conclusions” P1323-P14L1: delete “followed by” add “and” before “LRD” P14L1-2: delete the sentence “Significant differences were detected for both soil ECa and TCa content when compared between the rocky side and non-rocky side of each grade of rocky desertification areas.” P14L3: add “sites” after “studied”, delete “Furthermore” P14L5: Delete “(p<0.05) L14L6 Delete “the” Ca P14L6: Ca-indifferent” is correct? P14L7: “,” after “Themeda japonica”, delete “For these plants,” and put had P14L8: “High-Ca plants included *Pyracantha fortuneana*,” should be” High-Ca plants in our study were *Pyracantha fortuneana*, P14L10: delete “In this case” the sentence “the aboveground parts of these plant were able to maintain a higher Ca content under conditions of variable soil ECa content. ”should be” the aboveground parts of these plant were able to absorb a high Ca content from various of ECa content soils.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/bg-2017-392/bg-2017-392-RC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2017-392>, 2017.

BGD

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

