

# ***Interactive comment on “Reviews and Syntheses: Impacts of plant silica – herbivore interactions on terrestrial biogeochemical cycling” by Bernice C. Hwang and Daniel B. Metcalfe***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 16 November 2020

An interesting and timely paper on a neat concept - bringing together information about plant Si, herbivory and terrestrial biogeochemical fluxes. Table 1 and Figure 3 are of most interest - and they could be made more of in the text, to better convey and highlight the syntheses the authors have done (see below for suggestion on how).

After the introduction, Section 2 is about Silicon in terrestrial systems, and 3 Effects of silicon on herbivory, 4 Effects of herbivory on plant silicon, 4.1 Potential effects of herbivory on terrestrial silicon cycling and 5 Conclusions. The information providing sections 2, 3 and 4 make up a lot of the manuscript with the syntheses (4.1 and 5) a smaller component. One way to keep the focus on the synthesis, would be to re-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



move recommendations that are not clearly/directly associated with the synthesis (ie. in Sections 2 and 3). For example, Line 144 “Therefore, we need more field-based information about how Si content varies along large-scale environmental gradients to improve global biogeochemistry models.” – this might well be true, but it is a call to action on a topic that isn’t related to the paper, as it appears in Section 2 (that doesn’t mention herbivory at all). See also lines 158 and worth checking elsewhere.

Also, elevating section 4.1 to 5 (and renumbering the conclusion) would also help highlight the significance of this section. In 4.1 to make more of the key data (Fig 3, Table 1), they could be referred to in a more positive way. For example, for L220, could be changed from “We estimate that Si fluxes via the herbivory pathway can meet or exceed other major sources of Si, although flux information on some major habitat types is missing (Table 1).” to “Bringing together published Si flux data with estimates of herbivory for the first time, we estimate that Si fluxes via the herbivory pathway could meet or exceed other major sources of Si (Table 1), although flux information on some major habitat types is missing.” Similarly there is much more to Figure 3 there than just “It is, however, unclear whether the more mobilized Si is then absorbed by vegetation, taken up by microbes, or exported from the system (Fig. 3).” which is how it is first referred to.

The conclusion too, could better highlight what the author’s have done. For example, L247: “We have begun to understand the magnitude of impact of plant Si on herbivore populations and the potential impact of herbivores on Si fluxes” would be stronger as “Our analysis has shown the magnitude of impact of plant Si on herbivore populations and the potential impact of herbivores on Si fluxes”

Minor comments: L90: soil -> the soil. Also. there is a lot in this sentence with both Si recycling rates and introducing occluded C in phytoliths. Suggest breaking into two sentences. L94-96: can it also increase fluxes to rivers? For example, when leaves from deciduous forests fall, are there spike in Si fluxes to water ways? Figure 3b. Check arrow size between Si cycling and P cycling on the left hand side of the figure.

Interactive  
comment

