



EGUsphere, referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-488-RC2>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on egusphere-2022-488

Bas van Wesemael (Referee)

Referee 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-RC2>, 2022

The paper is well-written. It uses established techniques for meta-analysis developed in other domains and verifies to what extent these are respected in agricultural and soil science.

Lines 152-153 please break up this complex sentence and specify more clearly what your example 'such as the IPCC report' refers to.

Line 169 Please check the consistency of spelling: 'criterion' or 'criterium'?

Lines 191 I assume that all inclusion and exclusion criteria apply for the search strategy, even though 4-6 are not discussed. It would be helpful to stress that all criteria have been checked.

Line 205 'respectively' can easily be avoided: e.g. '344 in Web of Science and 208 in Scopus'. This facilitates the reading.

Line 209 Please refer to Table 2 for these criteria.

Line 216 I would suggest to use 'evaluated' instead of 'analyzed' in order not to use 'analy...' too much in one sentence.

Line 254 It would be helpful to remind the reader which scores.

Line 267 It is not clear that 'group' refers to the set of criteria in Table 1. As the table is quite large and on multiple pages, these groups are not evident.

Line 279 Please refer to table 1 to clearly link the groups to the text.

Line 295 Please delete 'studied'

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.

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

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).