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I appreciate the effort made by the authors in responding to my comments. However, my intention in my previous comment was not to receive a rebuttal. I still believe the authors have not addressed the main problems, i.e., (1) mismatch between their map (i.e., EthioSoil Grid map) and the Soil Atlas of Africa, and (2) relatively low accuracies of classification. In the attached document I have highlighted the various issues. I have also tried to identify reasons why the producer and user accuracies for some reference soil groups (RSGs). I encourage the authors to explore (1) opportunities to include other variables not included in the present analysis, (2) dimension reduction, (3) use of other cross-validation methods, and (4) use of an ensemble approach to see whether overall accuracy could be improved and classification errors reduce for individual RSGs. This way, I hope the classification errors could be reduced and a more refined map could be produced. I also encourage the authors in the long run to consider a map that shows the qualifiers for each of the major RSGs. For example, identifying the RSG as Calcic Cambisol, Chromic Cambisol, Dystric Cambisol, Eutric Cambisol, ... Vertic Cambisols is more informative than just saying Cambisols.

Please also note the supplement to this comment: https://egusphere.copernicus.org/preprints/egusphere-2022-301/egusphere-2022-301-CC3-supplement.pdf