

Interactive comment on “Agropedogenesis: Humankind as the 6th soil-forming factor and attractors of agrogenic soil degradation” by Yakov Kuzyakov and Kazem Zamanian

Peter Kühn

peter.kuehn@uni-tuebingen.de

Received and published: 6 September 2019

It was a pleasure to read the manuscript. I have some minor remarks, which may improve the strength of the discussion, if considered. Best wishes, Peter Kühn

General Remarks Chapters 1.2 and 2.1 In this context the scorpan model by McBratney et al. (2003; “On digital soil mapping”) should be discussed as well, which includes more than five soil forming factors and particularly their functions.

188-190: If the “convergence of soil properties” is not true in all cases, I recommend rephrasing the statement in line 188.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Interactive
comment

Chapter 2.7 Additionally different topographic positions should be discussed: upslope, midslope, toeslope and even positions. Do not soil properties diverge or converge despite of human impact just related to the topographic position of the soil? E.g. imagine calcareous substrate with a decalcified soil, at upslope positions and human-induced soil erosion; after some time the soil will have many properties of the substrate, particularly regarding carbonate content, pH, EC, and the content of some elements as e.g. Ca and Mg. These are also master properties of agropedogenesis as you defined in chapter 2.4. - And e.g. in toeslope positions you have often an additional material input from upslope positions, which influences also some master properties and might rule out convergent tendencies. Of course this is different under humid and arid climate conditions.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2019-151>, 2019.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

