

Interactive comment on “Comment on: “Recent revisions of phosphate rock reserves and resources: a critique” by Edixhoven et al. (2014) – Phosphate reserves and resources: what conceptions and data do stakeholders need for sustainable action?” by R. W. Scholz and F.-W. Wellmer

A. Kleidon (Editor)

akleidon@bgc-jena.mpg.de

Received and published: 26 April 2015

Dear authors,

The manuscript has received a number of reviews and comments.

The first review by Mew as well as the comment by Geissler and Steiner is in support of

C202

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



your commentary, providing additional background information as well as some minor comments for revision.

In contrast, the second review as well as the review by Edixhoven are quite critical of the commentary. Their main objection is that the points of the Edixhoven et al. paper have been misrepresented or that incorrect claims have been made about the Edixhoven et al. paper. The reviews also raise serious concerns whether your submission is in fact a commentary, given that it deals very little with the actual contents of the Edixhoven et al. paper.

I have carefully read the various documents. The discussion certainly shows that phosphorus reserves are an important topic that is surrounded with ambiguities that need to be clarified. Yet, I agree with the latter two reviews that this manuscript is not a commentary to the Edixhoven et al. paper.

For this to become an acceptable commentary, it requires a major revision, quite likely a complete overhaul of the manuscript, in which the focus is set on the actual paper by Edixhoven et al. that is being commented on. This may be supplemented with some limited information on the context, but this context must be much shorter than the specific discussions of the Edixhoven et al. paper. I also ask you to substantially shorten the manuscript to less than half its current size, focus on the major points only, and avoid overlap with already published material, as in Scholz and Wellmer (2013).

The revised manuscript will be reviewed again.

I know that this will involve substantial work on your side to revise the manuscript into this form. I am nevertheless convinced that such a shorter and more to the point commentary with a specific focus on the Edixhoven et al. paper will be a much more constructive contribution for an informed debate.

I am looking forward to the submission of the revised manuscript.

Axel Kleidon editor

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

