

Interactive comment on “Hierarchy theory in hydro pedology” by T. F. H. Allen et al.

H. Lin (Editor)

hul3@psu.edu

Received and published: 4 July 2009

First of all, I would like to thank the authors for their interest in hydro pedology and the time and efforts they put in presenting such a stimulating topic from a very different angle. The topic of this paper is indeed important – both cutting-edge and challenging. It is indeed not easy to get it all done well the 1st attempt for non-hydro pedologists to tackle one of the tough questions in hydro pedology. Nonetheless, the perspectives expressed by the experts of hierarchy theory and complex system are very much appreciated. I hope one way or another and sooner or later this topic is worth of publishing. As the 3rd reviewer pointed out, there are a number of valuable points in the manuscript that could be further developed or clarified so that it would be more appealing and clearer to the readers regarding how exactly hierarchy theory could be applied to hydro pedology. Like this reviewer pointed out, “getting the gist of applying hierarchy

theory to soil processes is most elusive.” In its current form, the paper does strike me as too general. It would benefit from some concrete examples from hydro pedology domain topics and especially hit some core issues of hydro pedology, such as the link between hierarchy theory – scaling issues – heterogeneity – structure and function of soil water processes. Another beneficial thing to include is perhaps a critical review of the overall accomplishments of hierarchy theory in other disciplines (especially ecology) and highlight its place in complexity systems theory in brief but crystallly clear manner.

In additional to the review comments provided by the three thoughtful reviewers, a couple of questions that I would like to further highlight are: 1) it appears the main use of hierarchy theory is central on conceptual organization of clearly-defined levels of analysis. Is this understanding correct or I missed something here? Any more quantitative means associated with this theory that could be utilized would also be desirable; and 2) the authors seemed to recommend to avoid middle number theory and suggested that the prediction is impossible with middle number theory, and yet hydro pedology seemed to invite many middle number specifications. I agree that intermediate scale is often the most difficult and often neglected, and yet it is also most important from the point of view of many practical applications. So I wonder whether there might be practical solution to this dilemma?

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 6, 2931, 2009.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper