



EGUsphere, author comment AC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-488-AC2>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Reply on RC2

Julia Fohrafellner et al.

Author comment on "Quality assessment of meta-analyses on soil organic carbon" by Julia Fohrafellner et al., EGU sphere, <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-488-AC2>, 2022

We want to thank the reviewer for his time and the critical reading of our manuscript. The suggested improvements were highly appreciated and all adopted into the manuscript. Below, we respond in more detail to comments which are including questions to the author team.

- Comments regarding lines 152 to 295: We changed the manuscript according to your comments.
- "Line 296-297 Do you have any explanation why the meta-analysis that responded to the strict 'cut-off criteria' showed a much poorer performance than the other ones? Please so remind the reader that the cut-off criteria are criteria 6-8 in Table 1. I had to look it up again. "

This figure shows that when considering only meta-analyses that fulfill the cut-off criteria (=true meta-analyses; striped bars), a lower % of studies complies with the quality criteria 9-17. Simply because the number of true meta-analyses is only 4, while "pseudo" meta-analyses is 27. Here we want to display that when including the pseudo-meta-analyses, the fulfillment of quality (%) might look better than when actually only considering true meta-analyses. As another reviewer also mentioned that our display is unclear, we will change the figures and display the results as stacked bars, including a new legend. Misunderstandings should be avoided that way.

- "Line 368 Did you check if there were any of the 31 papers identified earlier among these 16 papers in the IPCC report?"

No, this chapter of the report did not cite meta-analyses that were part of the 31 we analyzed.

- "Line 490 Please specify more clearly what 'all four reviews' refers to. Maybe refer to table 5. If you mean the four papers cited in lines 492-493, it should be five reviews (including your own)."

Yes, you are correct, we changed it accordingly.