

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Ecological restoration and soil improvement performance of the seabuckthorn flexible dam in the Pisha Sandstone area of Northwestern China” by F. S. Yang et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 30 October 2014

The manuscript is interesting for a research community but I suggest a major revision. The manuscript redaction is clever and understanding. I acknowledge the work and the accuracy in the descriptions of the experimentation work. In general I think that it is an interesting work for the scientific community and I recommend its publication after the corrections. Some general suggestions: You compared the results found in the SFD in a reforested gully. Some part of your results talking about the contrasted gully, but you described them. Please clarify that for a readers. In the Introduction: Careful with the citation order, in the text appear some errors -citation by chronological order-: line 26 in page 2805; line 7, 27 and 29 page 2806; line 18 and 21 page 2807. Probably you forgot some citation in the line 10 in page 2808. In the study area: You don't use

C1210

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



capital letters in the name of the gullies and rivers: line 10. You forgot use a reference o citation in the line 16 in page 2809 In the line 23 in page 2809 you use ...0.04 (4 m vertical: 100 m horizontal)... I suggest to modify by 4%. The figure 4 don't show a SFD type I suggest to modify it About the Soil moisture contents It is a confusion for a reader because your period of measurements was 1996-2010 and here you talk about different statements. Clarify or remove this part Soil organic matter and nutrients was measured only in 2010? In this part, Determining of species diversity and vegetation coverage. Do you need explain better what mean because it is confuse for a reader. Please I suggest to change (1), (2)... by i), ii)... In line 5-10 In results and discussion: Where is the discussion? The results are so confuse, because you talk about EG1 and WG6, or compared the reforested gully with the non-vegetated gully and you forgot to describe it. You compared the SFD with different analysis but in different time and not all (table 1,2 and figures 6-10). I suggest removed the figure 8d and 9b, because are confuse for a reader.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/6/C1210/2014/sed-6-C1210-2014-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., 6, 2803, 2014.

SED

6, C1210–C1211, 2014

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

