Dear Editor,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript. We have addressed the two minor revisions requested by Reviewer 2.

Kind regards,

Jonathan

Response to anonymous reviewer (RC2)

1) *RC2: The sentence on lines 344-345 doesn't make sense, please check.*

   AR: We revised this sentence: *"We limited the calculation of SQs to the soil properties common among all five soil sources, which were soil texture, rock fragments, and soil depth."*

2) *RC2: Line 461 : I was quite confused by this sentence on first reading. I think these accuracies represent estimated agreement between field texture class data and (unknown) actual field texture classes of the evaluation datasets, using the weighted mean as per lines 270 – 275. I think a slight rewording from 'Estimated accuracies' to perhaps 'Estimated agreement between … and …' could help the reader here, and perhaps a reminder/pointer to the part of the method section to refer to.*

   AR: Thank you for this suggestion. We have adopted the suggested terminology to help clarify this section. *"Due to potential inaccuracies in field estimated soil texture classes, we estimated the agreement between field and laboratory measured texture classes using our global meta-analysis of soil field texture measurement accuracy. Estimated agreement (± standard deviation) between field and laboratory values was 58 ±10% and 53 ±11% for the FTF-M2F and M2F evaluation datasets, respectively. Estimated agreement increased to 90 ±5% for FTF-M2F and 86 ±11% for M2F when allowing for class adjacency (OAadj)."*