

Access Review (Quick Report), Peer-Review & Interactive Public Discussion (BGD)

Manuscripts submitted to BG at first undergo a rapid access review (initial manuscript evaluation), which is not meant to be a full scientific review but to identify and sort out manuscripts with obvious major deficiencies in view of the above principal evaluation criteria.

Manuscripts rated 4 (poor) in any of the principal criteria are normally rejected without further review and discussion. Manuscripts rated 1-3 (excellent-fair) in all criteria are normally published on the Biogeosciences Discussions (BGD) website, the discussion forum of BG, where they are subject to full peer-review and Interactive Public Discussion.

In the full review and interactive discussion the referees and other interested members of the scientific community are asked to take into account all of the following aspects:

1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of BG?

Yes. Biological soil crust is dominant component that cover about 70 % of the open undisturbed spaces of dry lands worldwide. The BSC considered as ecosystem engineer in semiarid and arid landscapes. The amount of BSC-derived organic carbon (OC) input into soils and its chemical composition under natural conditions has rarely been investigated. Therefore, the organic carbon dynamics and chemistry of the BSC should be scientifically addressed.

2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data?

Yes.

3. Are substantial conclusions reached?

Yes.

4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined?

Yes.

5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions?

Yes.

6. Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)?

Yes.

7. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution?

Yes. In the Discussion section there is a very good and proper credit to related studies of other scientists while indicating the results of this study.

8. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper?

Yes.

9. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary?

Yes.

10. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear?

Yes. They did Excellent job with that.

11. Is the language fluent and precise?

Yes.

12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used?

Yes.

13. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated?

No.

14. Are the number and quality of references appropriate?

Yes.

15. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate?

Yes.