

### **Author's feedback against Editorial comments:**

Please find my decision for manuscript no Ms IJPSS 24304. The manuscript must be significantly improved.

However, the manuscript must be significantly improved first.

1. Unfortunately, the manuscript is not amended in accordance with all reviewer's suggestions and requirements. The Author also does not explain why these corrections are not introduced.  
Key words are not updated – **keywords are updated with saponin included**  
**List of abbreviations is not** added – **Not sure which abbreviations are referred to here, all abbreviations are now first spelled out in text.**
  - Phrase 'to determine significant differences (P<0.05)' is not corrected - **corrected**
  - Tables should be changed into figures – **figures have been inserted, tables also remain as each provide a different aspect of the analysis.**
  - **A scheme describing how the structure of saponins interacts with particles and aggregates to soil is included to the manuscript – I agree this would be a good addition. However, a review of literature did not turn up a definitive paper on the soil aggregation effects from saponins. Also, this manuscript doesn't really take into account these affects. The manuscript of more an investigation of the use of the powdered root form. Pure saponins were not used. Hopefully the paper will encourage a reader to investigate this aspect.**
  - **And some other details mentioned in the** reviews – **I reviewed these missing corrections and have revised accordingly to the best of my knowledge.**
2. English name of *Saponaria officinalis* must be introduced to the title. Alternatively, English and Latin name must be provided together in Abstract. - **this has been corrected**
3. Generally, tables and figures in scientific papers must be self-explanatory, so all abbreviations must be explained below tables or in figures caption. It must be explained what SW, StdDev, GLM and K mean in Tables. - **this too was corrected, GLM is explained at line 152**
4. The titles of all Tables are misleading. The Tables present results which were measured (drainage rate, infiltration rate, H<sub>2</sub>O retention) and statistical analysis. But in the titles of Tables only statistical analysis is mentioned. - **titles were revised**
5. Presentation of results in Tables is extremely unfriendly. All measurable data should be provided in Figures, and statistical analysis should be presented separately. Statistical data may be presented in tables. - **agreed, I left the tables, but added several figures for the infiltration**
6. Section COMPETING INTERESTS should be corrected because only one author is.  
Section AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS is not necessary because only one author is.