



EGUsphere, referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-270-RC2>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on egusphere-2022-270

Anonymous Referee #2

Referee comment on "Soil and crop management practices and the water regulation functions of soils: a qualitative synthesis of meta-analyses relevant to European agriculture" by Guillaume Blanchy et al., EGU Sphere,
<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-270-RC2>, 2022

The topic of this review is interesting and covers a necessary research line. Authors have made a huge work collecting data from literature. The list of topics and cases is really huge, and the length of the manuscript is large. However, and after reading the manuscript, I have the feeling that I have not read anything new, or the new content has not been highlighted enough. Everything is known and expected. It is true that Figure 5 is valuable and could be appreciated by potential readers, but I cannot find the new content that any publication has to include. Several aspects should be addressed, namely:

- Authors have said that the aim of this review is to evaluate "the impacts of soil and crop management practices on soil properties and processes and the various ecosystem services and functions delivered by soil" and "these analyses with respect to the water regulation functions that are relevant for climate change adaptation in Europe". However, no information is provided any the potential scenarios of climate change in Europe. For sure, adaptation will be different depending on the magnitude of climate change. I don't think that this review is focussed on adaptation to climate change.

- Abstract. Authors have made a good job summarizing all sections of the manuscript. However, I miss the novel aspect of this review. In my opinion, the usefulness of a review of published meta-analysis is the emergence of new aspects that cannot be observed by the individualized analysis of each study. Therefore, I encourage authors to include in the abstract the actual contribution of this review: Where is the novelty?

- Section 2. Authors have included three sub-sections, namely: Literature search, Quality assessment, and Redundancy, but there is no information about the statistical analysis of the extracted information. Before showing the results, authors have to explain in detail, in a new sub-section, what they did with the data and information that they extracted from the selected literature. In my opinion, in a review study, there are 3 main aspects: I) what is the gap that you want to fill in; II) data mining; and III) methods and techniques to

analyse the extracted information. Please, improve your manuscript taking into account these three aspects.

- L.154: Please, provide arguments (e.g. references) to support the comment that macroporosity should be strongly correlated with soil water infiltration.