

2

3 Dear Anonymous Referee #3, thank you for reviewing our manuscript and for providing your detailed  
4 assessment as well as the additional references. We address the points you raised below.

5

6 **AR3 #1: In the manuscript, the authors recognise (Line 465) the occurrence of deposition from**  
7 **wind erosion and dust emission elsewhere. The source of that deposition could be from nearby**  
8 **and therefore include a wide range of particle sizes (coarse material will not be preferentially**  
9 **removed with distance). Alternatively, that deposited material may be distal and therefore**  
10 **associated with fine material very likely enriched in fallout radionuclides. In their approach to**  
11 **establishing a reference site, the authors have neglected to consider that their chosen site may be**  
12 **influenced by deposited aeolian material. A larger reference inventory would change the**  
13 **magnitude of losses and gains identified at sites made relative to that site. The results are therefore**  
14 **uncertain depending on the amount of deposited aeolian material at the native grassland site by**  
15 **contrast to deposition at the other sites.**

16 **The corollary is that deposited aeolian material is likely to be occurring across the region as the**  
17 **authors suggest (Line 465). If different sources of that deposited material are proximal and distal,**  
18 **then the deposited particle size distribution will change and consequently the FRN concentration**  
19 **per unit mass will change. These changes in concentrations do not conform to the expected**  
20 **behaviour of the approach and its underlying assumptions (Chappell, 1999). The uncertainty is**  
21 **further dependent on the mixing of deposited material from different sources.**

22 Reply to AR3 #1: We agree and add and/or change text as follows:

23 l. 168: *Furthermore, sampling focused on upland agricultural areas with level surfaces to minimise the*  
24 *possibility of fluvial erosion and aeolian influx affecting the SOM content (and FRN concentrations).*

25 l. 193: *Likewise, we cannot assess effects of soil particle fluxes that may alter inventories in the*  
26 *composite reference samples (cf. Chappell, 1999; Sect. 4.4). (see also AR3 #2)*

27 l. 325: *Exceeding  $^{239+240}\text{Pu}$  has been proposed to reflect grain-size dependent preferential adsorption*  
28 *patterns (e.g. Everett et al., 2008, Xu et al., 2017), and such a pattern could become important in case*  
29 *of selective erosion or soil particle influx.*

30 l. 474: *If such regional patterns of sediment redistribution caused significant influx of soil particles to*  
31 *reference sites from both local and regional sources after global fallout (cf. Wiggs and Holmes, 2010),*  
32 *it is possible that FRN inventories have been subject to alterations. As our methodological approach*  
33 *relies on undisturbed reference sites, significant influx to the reference sites would violate that most*  
34 *important precondition. Chappell (1999) showed that influx of soil particles can significantly alter  $^{137}\text{Cs}$*   
35 *specific activities at a reference plateau site located in semi-arid bushland. Influx of distal dust particles*  
36 *may increase FRN concentrations (Chappell, 1999), more proximal influx of coarser grains could dilute*  
37 *them (Funk et al., 2011). Hence, post-fallout accumulation of soil particles on our reference sites could*  
38 *have different effects on the overall FRN concentrations, depending on the concentration of FRNs in the*  
39 *deposited soil particles (generally linked to soil particle grain size and source). However, visual*  
40 *inspection of the reference sites before sampling suggested that significant coarse-grained influx from*  
41 *local sources can be ruled out. In addition, Funk et al. (2011) demonstrated that  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  reference sites*  
42 *rather unaffected by aeolian deposition could be identified in their study region, which resembles our*  
43 *study setting (grassland plateau site in Mongolia with significant wind erosion). We also note that soil*  
44 *bulk densities are generally homogenous across the individual agroecosystems and that the  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  and*  
45  *$^{239+240}\text{Pu}$  concentrations we obtained are strongly correlated (Fig. 3). Given that  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  and  $^{239+240}\text{Pu}$  are*  
46 *suspected to show somewhat different grain size and SOM-dependent adsorption patterns (Sect. 1.3),*

47 *the finding could imply that influx to the reference sites was limited. Furthermore, given that reference*  
48 *sites were located directly adjacent to the eroding sites, alterations of the relative inventories due to soil*  
49 *particle influx should decrease in significance at decreasing YOCs.*

50

51 **AR3 #2: The authors have provided a very basic description of the assumptions upon which the**  
52 **fallout radionuclides are used to estimate soil redistribution (around Line 125). I think a much**  
53 **clearer description of the assumptions is required. I think this description needs to be updated**  
54 **with the alternative approach using resampling (Li et al., 2011). Most importantly, I think it is**  
55 **essential that this description in the manuscript is improved by including a more critical**  
56 **evaluation of the approach including the work by Foster and Parsons (2011), the Comment by**  
57 **Mabit et al. (2011) and other arising commentary since then.**

58 Reply to AR3 #2: We add and/or change text as follows:

59 l. 124: *The method to assess soil redistribution by using FRN concentrations relies on several*  
60 *assumptions which should be met (for an overview, see e.g. Van Pelt, 2013; Zapata, 2002; a critical*  
61 *assessment of the technique and a reply to the critical view are provided by Parsons and Foster, 2011,*  
62 *and Mabit et al., 2013, respectively). One precondition of the widely used traditional sampling approach*  
63 *(cf. Li et al., 2011) is that of a homogeneous distribution of the target FRN over the limited area covering*  
64 *the undisturbed reference site and the nearby eroding sites.*

65 l. 130: *A certain variance attached to reference inventories may be inevitable but can be reduced by*  
66 *applying the repeated-sampling-approach, which relies on on-site point-specific reference inventories*  
67 *(Li et al., 2011; Kachanoski and De Jong, 1984). Such a sampling strategy, however, would require a*  
68 *resampling campaign and hence be difficult to implement in our case given possible changes in land*  
69 *use and cropping practices since 1998 as well as individual permits required.*

70 *A reasonable application of the traditional approach relies on reference sites that ideally are vegetated*  
71 *with perennial grass or low herb cover (Pennock and Appleby, 2002) and shielded from sediment*  
72 *deposition, such as likely achieved on level upland sites (Funk et al., 2011).*

73 l. 135: *While <sup>137</sup>Cs sorption has been found to be generally dependent on the availability of cation*  
74 *exchange sites in soils and hence on clay mineralogy (Mabit et al., 2013; Parsons and Foster, 2011), it*  
75 *might bind more selectively to the clay fraction compared to plutonium, implying that <sup>137</sup>Cs could be*  
76 *more sensitive to preferential transport (Xu et al., 2017).*

77 l. 182: *Up to nine different agricultural plots were sampled per agroecosystem, with the requirement*  
78 *that the cultivation history (up to 98 yrs) could be precisely ascertained and a reference site could be*  
79 *sampled adjacent to the eroding site (cf. Lobe, 2003).*

80 l. 185: *The latter were included in order to test whether the topsoil sampling approach captured most*  
81 *of the plutonium stored within the soil column (cf. Parsons and Foster, 2011).*

82 L. 190: *The sampling scheme, which originally did not focus on FRN analyses, has some disadvantages*  
83 *potentially biasing FRN data interpretation (cf. Sect. 1.3). Firstly, the lack of high-resolution depth*  
84 *profile samples means that we are unable to present FRN mass depth profile data. Consequently, we*  
85 *cannot reasonably infer mass redistribution rates as typically presented in FRN studies (e.g. Alewell et*  
86 *al., 2014; Lal et al., 2013; Meusburger et al., 2018). Likewise, we cannot assess effects of soil particle*  
87 *fluxes that may alter inventories in the composite reference samples (cf. Chappell, 1999; Sect. 4.4),*  
88 *although visual inspection suggests that significant coarse-grained influx from local sources can be*  
89 *ruled out. Finally, amalgamation of the reference site samples (n = 7-9 samples per agroecosystem;*  
90 *with n = 5 subsamples per site) implies that we cannot provide statistical measures to evaluate the*  
91 *accuracy of fallout inventories in the reference samples.*

92 l. 303: *In order to investigate whether plutonium could have migrated below this soil layer (e.g. Parsons*  
93 *and Foster, 2011), samples spanning the depth interval 20-40 cm were analysed for selected sites from*  
94 *the Tweespruit (n = 4) and Harrismith (n = 2) agroecosystems.*

95

96 **AR3 #3: The abstract does not adequately represent the issue that the identification of wind**  
97 **erosion needs to be without the presence of water erosion. I think this topic is reasonably well**  
98 **described in the main text, perhaps with the inclusion of Van Pelt et al. (2017).**

99 Reply to AR3 #3: We rephrase as sentence in the abstract and add the reference (l. 149 & 152).

100 l. 26-28: *Wind erosion has previously been shown to play a dominant role in soil particle loss from*  
101 *agricultural sites in the Highveld, and the level plots we investigate here did not show any evidence of*  
102 *fluvial erosion. Hence, we interpret the fate of soil fines, including SOM, to be governed by wind erosion.*

103

104 **AR3 #4: The word ‘flat’ is used throughout the manuscript to incorrectly describe how level the**  
105 **land surface is. The word flat is a description of the land surface roughness and should be replaced**  
106 **with the word level, as appropriate.**

107 Reply to AR3 #4: We follow your advice and change the terms accordingly (l. 81, 97, 130, 169).

108

109 **AR3 #5: Line 165 “Since our samples were already taken in 1998 and have been characterised in**  
110 **numerous studies (Amelung et al., 2002; Lobe...” This sentence is ambiguous in the description of**  
111 **the characterisation. Please rephrase.**

112 Reply to AR3 #5: We rephrase:

113 l. 165: *The samples analysed in this study were taken in 1998 and splits from these samples have been*  
114 *measured in previous studies to investigate a variety of soil components and patterns of soil degradation*  
115 *over time (Sect. 1.2). In the following, we give a brief overview of the sampling strategy that was applied.*

116

## 117 **Other changes made to the manuscript**

118 Words or letters added/removed:

119 l. 18: losses → loss

120 l. 22: + during the

121 l. 87: cropping → cultivation (YOC)

122 l. 137: regime → regimes

123 l. 305: + indicate

124 l. 360, 365, 368, 404, 421, 424: years of cropping → YOC

125 l. 408: + 1.2 and

126 l. 469: are likely to arise from the → could arise from

127 l. 517: + We thank three anonymous referees, whose comments have significantly improved the quality  
128 of this paper.

129 Section titles changed:

130 l. 164: 2.1 Sampling strategy and sample processing → 2.1 *Sampling strategy*

131 l. 194: + 2.2 *Sample processing*

132 l. 223: 2.2 FRN measurements → 2.3 *FRN measurements*

133 l. 246: 2.3 Interpretation of  $^{239+240}\text{Pu}$  results → 2.4 *Interpretation of  $^{239+240}\text{Pu}$  results*

134 l. 374: 4.3 Temporal limitation of  $^{239+240}\text{Pu}$  topsoil inventories → 4.3 *Factors that may influence the*  
135 *interpretation of  $^{239+240}\text{Pu}$  topsoil inventories*

136

## 137 **References**

138 Alewell, C., Meusburger, K., Juretzko, G., Mabit, L., and Ketterer, M. E.: Suitability of  $^{239+240}\text{Pu}$  and  
139  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  as tracers for soil erosion assessment in mountain grasslands, *Chemosphere*, 103, 274-280,  
140 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2013.12.016>, 2014.

141 Chappell, A.: The limitations of using  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  for estimating soil redistribution in semi-arid  
142 environments, *Geomorphology*, 29, 135-152, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-555X\(99\)00011-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-555X(99)00011-2), 1999.

143 Everett, S. E., Tims, S. G., Hancock, G. J., Bartley, R., and Fifield, L. K.: Comparison of Pu and  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  as  
144 tracers of soil and sediment transport in a terrestrial environment, *Journal of Environmental*  
145 *Radioactivity*, 99, 383-393, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvrad.2007.10.019>, 2008.

146 Funk, R., Li, Y., Hoffmann, C., Reiche, M., Zhang, Z., Li, J., and Sommer, M.: Using  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  to estimate  
147 wind erosion and dust deposition on grassland in Inner Mongolia-selection of a reference site and  
148 description of the temporal variability, *Plant and Soil*, 351, 293-307, 10.1007/s11104-011-0964-y,  
149 2011.

150 Kachanoski, R. G. and de Jong, E.: Predicting the Temporal Relationship between Soil Cesium-137 and  
151 Erosion Rate, *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 13, 301-304,  
152 <https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq1984.00472425001300020025x>, 1984.

153 Lal, R., Tims, S. G., Fifield, L. K., Wasson, R. J., and Howe, D.: Applicability of  $^{239}\text{Pu}$  as a tracer for soil  
154 erosion in the wet-dry tropics of northern Australia, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics*  
155 *Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms*, 294, 577-583,  
156 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nimb.2012.07.041>, 2013.

157 Li, S., Lobb, D. A., Kachanoski, R. G., and McConkey, B. G.: Comparing the use of the traditional and  
158 repeated-sampling-approach of the  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  technique in soil erosion estimation, *Geoderma*, 160, 324-  
159 335, 10.1016/j.geoderma.2010.09.029, 2011.

160 Lobe, I.: Fate of organic matter in sandy soils of the South African Highveld as influenced by the  
161 duration of arable cropping, *Bayreuther bodenkundliche Berichte*, 79, Lehrstuhl für Bodenkunde und  
162 *Bodengeographie der Univ. Bayreuth*, Bayreuth2003.

163 Mabit, L., Meusburger, K., Fulajtar, E., and Alewell, C.: The usefulness of  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  as a tracer for soil  
164 erosion assessment: A critical reply to Parsons and Foster (2011), *Earth-Science Reviews*, 127, 300-  
165 307, 10.1016/j.earscirev.2013.05.008, 2013.

166 Meusburger, K., Porto, P., Mabit, L., La Spada, C., Arata, L., and Alewell, C.: Excess Lead-210 and  
167 Plutonium-239+240: Two suitable radiogenic soil erosion tracers for mountain grassland sites,  
168 *Environ Res*, 160, 195-202, 10.1016/j.envres.2017.09.020, 2018.

169 Parsons, A. J. and Foster, I. D. L.: What can we learn about soil erosion from the use of  $^{137}\text{Cs}$ ?, *Earth-*  
170 *Science Reviews*, 108, 101-113, 10.1016/j.earscirev.2011.06.004, 2011.

171 Pennock, D. and Appleby, P.: Site selection and sampling design, in: *Handbook for the assessment of*  
172 *soil erosion and sedimentation using environmental radionuclides*, Springer, 15-40, 2002.

173 Van Pelt, R. S.: Use of anthropogenic radioisotopes to estimate rates of soil redistribution by wind I:  
174 *Historic use of  $^{137}\text{Cs}$ , Aeolian Research*, 9, 89-102, 10.1016/j.aeolia.2012.11.004, 2013.

175 Wiggs, G. and Holmes, P.: Dynamic controls on wind erosion and dust generation on west-central  
176 Free State agricultural land, South Africa, *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 36, 827-838,  
177 <https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.2110>, 2010.

178 Xu, Y., Pan, S., Wu, M., Zhang, K., and Hao, Y.: Association of Plutonium isotopes with natural soil  
179 particles of different size and comparison with <sup>137</sup>Cs, *Science of The Total Environment*, 581-582,  
180 541-549, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.12.162>, 2017.

181 Zapata, F.: *Handbook for the assessment of soil erosion and sedimentation using environmental*  
182 *radionuclides*, Springer2002.

183