

*We would like to thank the reviewer for the constructive comments and suggestions. Below we explain how we will address these suggestions. Our responses are in italics.*

1. There are quite a lot of grammatical and style issues with the presentation that distract from ease of reading. There are also many examples of non-scientific terms such as 'pretty' that are going to confuse people for whom English is a second language.

*We will revise the language and choose less sloppy formulations*

2. The rationale for the tool is good, and is well explained.

*We are glad that we could explain the rational of the tool satisfactorily*

3. Paragraph beginning line 69: several statements are made that read more as opinions instead of evidence. Given that this is where you are justifying a large part of the effort required for involvement, I think your statements need to have good evidence here.

*We are not sure about this comment. In this part of the manuscript we describe how the KLIB is structured and what our intensions are to do so. These are not opinions, we just explain why we have structured the KLIB the way it is. We will qualify the few statements in this context to make clear that this is our interpretation of the situation (e.g. that the additional effort for the KLIB is not too big if the user has read and understood a paper, or that the KLIB will become more valuable the more paper it contains).*

4. There are probably as many different ways to design this kind of system as there are soil scientists. Please give a bit more justification for the structure of the overall system, particularly in terms of which factors are considered important for data entry.

*We will add a paragraph on the major motivation for developing the Klib which mainly comes from mechanistic soil modeling where many processes are not known in detail and we need to rely on empirical findings reported for well-defined experiments.*

5. The Technical Implementation section needs to come much earlier, so that the reader can visualise not just what you have done, but how you have done it. I suggest having it as section 3.2.

*We agree and will move the technical Implementation section to the position 3.2*

6. The Technical Implementation section does not contain enough detail for the work to be duplicated.

*We do not believe that anyone wants to duplicate the KLIB. After all, it is publicly available and can be used by anyone. Therefore, we limit the description to the used software tools, which might be important for those who want to program similar applications.*