



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_27701
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of hydraulic resistance of soil surface seals in relation to sediment particle size
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. Abstract is ok.</p> <p>2. Introduction is not sufficient and also not properly written. There is no reference of experimental study done by author.</p> <p>3. As a reviewer, I found theory section is also not enough and justify the present study. Some more explanation, review and background are required.</p> <p>4. There is no figure or diagram of experimental setup found in the manuscript.</p> <p>5. Explanation is not suitably understood through/for proposed model.</p> <p>6. Verification of results is not done for proposed model accurately.</p> <p>7. Conclusion is not reflecting anyway the presented manuscript as an original research article.</p> <p>Ethical issues: Yes, Authors suggested few equations from their study which must be scientific; valid and appropriate; how rigorous authors can be interpreting their work.</p>	<p>Additional information has been added to the introduction.</p> <p>Figure of the experimental setup has been provided.</p> <p>In fact the proposed model is an extension from previous studies by the author, all of which have been appropriately cited and referenced (Tuffour and Bonsu, 2015; Tuffour et al., 2015; Tuffour and Abubakari, 2015).</p> <p>The suggested equations have all been duly explained in the manuscript. In order not to create a double standard, readers have been referred to previous studies on the subject (e.g., Segeren and Trout, 1991; Tuffour and Bonsu, 2015; Tuffour et al., 2015; Tuffour and Abubakari, 2015), where details of the previous models from which the current one was evoked have been</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please include the correlation between proposed model and its verification with laboratory experiments.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	However, the manuscript in its current status is not as convincing for this journal. Please improve the written content.	