



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_32845
Title of the Manuscript:	Spread Sheets for Laterals Spacing Design, With an Application on Mit Kenana Area in Egypt
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. there is a chance that an essentially different manuscript on the subject could be suitable. Please consider expanding the scope of your spreadsheet to include other design parameters and re-submit.</li> <li>2. Method validation is not persuasive enough. Please see my minor comments #4</li> <li>3. Regarding the usage of spreadsheet, have you considered using the SOLVER FUNCTION under DATA tab? It might accelerate the calculation.</li> <li>4. Also, because Microsoft Excel is not an open source program, please provide your software licence.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All design parameters for laterals spacing design of steady state subsurface drainage systems are already included.</li> <li>2. Same traditional Hooghoudt equations are used to get the spacing design, so the results are almost identical. The main objective of this paper is to ease and accelerate accurate design process for all users, including different options for each case.</li> <li>3. Solver is a good tool for optimization, for instance maximizing laterals spacing, and it may be employed for other cases.</li> <li>4. Excel software is an instance for spreadsheets. It is not difficult to get Excel software with licence and it is commonly used. However, my software licence is attached.</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The unit of Q is different between section 3 (m/day) and section 4 (mm/day). Please validate.</li> <li>2. Section 5 is too short. Discussions are needed for each table, figure included. It is always better not to make readers / reviewers guess your inferences. Please be specific.</li> <li>3. Section 5: line 161 – 162. "It is obvious": Please refrain from using definite vocabulary.</li> <li>4. What was the method employed in designing the</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The unit of Q is unified to be (m/day), and is highlighted in yellow in the revised paper.</li> <li>2. Discussions are made more detailed, and are highlighted in yellow in the revised paper.</li> <li>3. OK, "obvious" is changed and is highlighted in yellow in the revised paper.</li> <li>4. Please see Compulsory comment #2.</li> </ol>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>existing drainage system at the study site? I am curious that if the designers (of Mit Kenama drainage system) also employed the same equation during their job, shouldn't the results be identical?</p> <p>5. Section 6, line 181 "It is concluded...": perhaps it is better to let the readers decide the merits of your contributions.</p> <p>6. References should be re-written entirely. Please kindly check the reference styles of the journal. Please pay attention also to the followings:</p> <p>6.1 Replace [4] with a different reference because Wikipedia is not a valid scientific reference</p> <p>6.2 Please check how to cite Internet sources, and correct accordingly, e.g. [4] and [5]</p> <p>6.3 Abbreviations are not explained prior to mentioning, e.g. USDA, EFH, etc.</p> <p>6.4 The reference styles are <b>NOT CONCISE</b></p>	<p>5. OK. "It is concluded" is cancelled in the revised paper.</p> <p>6.1 Reference [4] is changed and is highlighted in yellow in the revised paper.</p> <p>6.2 Reference [5] is modified and is highlighted in yellow in the revised paper.</p> <p>6.3 Abbreviations are explained prior to mentioning and are highlighted in yellow in the revised paper.</p>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>The manuscript is written in fairly good English, easy to understand, and this is the strongest point. Basically, what has been accomplished is a spreadsheet to automate the calculation of a well-studied calculation through commercial computer software. Although it is nice to have, especially for designers or engineers, the novelty is weak. In fact, developing spreadsheets is more of a conventional design step than an original scientific contribution.</p>	<p>No comment.</p>