



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 2. Method validation is not persuasive enough. Please see my minor comments #4 3. Regarding the usage of spreadsheet, have you considered using the SOLVER FUNCTION under DATA tab? It might accelerate the calculation. 4. Also, because Microsoft Excel is not an open source program, please provide your software licence. 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The unit of Q is different between section 3 (m/day) and section 4 (mm/day). Please validate. 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. 3. Section 5: line 161 – 162. “It is obvious”: Please refrain from using definite vocabulary. 4. What was the method employed in designing the 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 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>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 NOT CONCISE</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript is written in fairly good English, easy to understand, and this is the strongest point.</p> <p>Basically, what has been accomplished is a spreadsheet to automate the calculation of a well-studied calculation through a commercial computer software. Although it is nice to have, especially for designers or engineers, the novelty is weak.</p> <p>In fact, developing spreadsheets is more of a conventional design step than an original scientific contribution.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ho Huu Loc</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Kyoto University, Japan</i>