



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_24304 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | The water infiltration, hydraulic conductivity and water retention effects of ground <i>Saponaria officinalis</i> (L.) root as a soil surfactant |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <p>The study area characteristics description is not provided. The SAS software used, which version, author and year?</p> <p>Is the experiment a pot one or field experiment? Which experiment design was used? Any steps taken to minimise inherent biases in the experimental methodology?</p> <p>Reason(s) for the choice of method?</p> | <p>SAS 9.3, now added, that's all the information typically required. It indicates the year and the authorship is SAS. Since it's a very common software it's not necessary to cite more.</p> <p>This was a laboratory study so there were no field biases caused by climate. The design was a 3x4 factorial design; 3 soil types, 4 treatments, with 3 replications. (placed in text) The replications also reduced bias. Additional replications would be desirable, but some drainage times took 8 hours to complete. The entire data collection of the study took more than 8 weeks to complete.</p> <p>The methodology is taken from: Mobbs TL, Peters RT, Davenport JR, Evans MA, Wu JQ. Effects of four soil surfactants on four soil-water properties in sand and silt loam J of Soil and Water Conserv. 2012;67:275-283; and Abu-Zreig M, Rudra RP, Dickinson WT. Effect of application of surfactants on hydraulic properties of soils. Biosyst Eng. 2003;84:363-372. I added a</p> |



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>Tables not correctly label and refer to in the text. Eg. Table 1a, b, c and also Table 2a, b, c etc.</p> <p>The result was not discussed in the context of contemporary literature. Reason(s) were not assigned to the result obtained. Please, strengthen the discussion.</p> <p>Abbreviations should be written in full at the first appearance, and place in parenthesis. Eg. Hydraulic conductivity (K) and subsequently the abbreviation can be alone.</p> | <p>stronger sentence indicating this.</p> <p>I re-identified each table as suggested, in the text and tables This was corrected with a better set of tables and each referred to independently in the text.</p> <p>Now that the Discussion has been moved from Conclusion I believe this issue is resolved.</p> <p>This was corrected</p> |
|--|---|---|



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> | <p>The conclusion is too verbose. The conclusion should be based on your result but not on general literature</p> <p>I suppose the conclusion is rather your discussion. Please, consider sending the write under conclusion to the discussion rather. Only the last paragraph under the conclusion fit the conclusion.</p> | <p>The discussion was inadvertently placed in the conclusion and is now in 3.2 Discussion.</p> <p>This was corrected</p> <p>I have moved the proper portion to Discussion</p> |
| <p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p> | <p>The use of language is just right.</p> | |