

Final Author Comments

“Effects of soil depth on the dynamics of selected soil properties among the highland resources of Northeast wollega, Ethiopia” by A. Adugna and A. Abegaz

The comments, both general and specific comments, given on our paper are constructive and will have significant contribution to improve the quality of our paper. In this regard we would like to appreciate the contributors for their concern and scholarly comments. Here under, therefore, we responded to the comments as follows:

Responses to Anonymous Referee # 1

1. Abstract Section

-He commented “problem (research) is not included in the abstract section.” We accept this comment and will include research problem in the abstract section for the final submission.

-“Better to include the quantitative values of the soil parameters in the abstract” we also accept this comment and will include the quantitative values of soil parameters for the final submission. Of course, the quantitative values of soil parameters were sufficiently presented under result and discussion section.

2. Methodology

-“the author should include land use map of the study area.” We described the land use types of the study area under which soil samples were collected. These are presented under table 1. We thought describing land use types in such away is sufficient to inform our readers the resources we are talking about. It is, however, possible to include in the final submission the land use map as suggested by the referee.

2.2. Soil sampling

The purpose of having 100m×100m tiles is to maintain the homogeneity of the area and minimize the effects of slopes on the variability of soil parameters. We accept the comments of the referee put as “ describe reasons why you prefer to take sample from each plot at 5 points;

show the plots and points of sampling using the photographs; present soil analysis before statistical analysis.”

3. Results and discussion

-“relate the state of art of land degradation with soil variability among different land use.” We accept this comment and currently we are actively working in it. Perhaps, we have already addressed the state of art of land degradation with depth among different land uses under result and discussion sections. We further do on it as suggested by the referee to improve the quality of the paper.

4. Conclusion section

- “make your conclusion smart” we accept this comment and will polish our conclusion further

Respond to Comments of Anonymous Referee # 2

1. Abstract

- The referee said “don’t use abbreviations in the abstract.” We accept this comment and use the full name of soil parameters than using abbreviation in abstract and conclusion sections.

- We accept comments given on line 15 (Page 2012) under abstract section and line 7-9 (Page 2013 and line 27 (Page 2013).

2. Materials and methods

- We accept comments that request us to improve the quality and readability of figure 1

2.3. Soil analysis: line 3 (page 2016) = we accept it

3. Results and discussion

3.1.1. Particle size distribution: line 1(page 2018)

The percentage changes of clay particle size distribution of subsoil from topsoil were increasing in all land use contrary to sandy soil.

3.1.3. We accept the comments given about Total Nitrogen (TN)

4. Conclusion

-line 24 we accept the comments that suggest “ discuss the state of the art of sodium (NA) under result and discussion section as you did under conclusion part

-lines 3-4 (page 2017)- here also we accept the comment of the referee i.e. we shall adapt ‘soil layer’ consistently than using or mixing ‘soil horizons’

-lines 14-19 (page 2017)- we follow the recommendation of the referee

-figure 2: we shall consider the corrections; bring the charges in superscription position; change the value -2.99 of clay to -3 and the value of pH from -3.3 into -3. In the same figure it was recommended to change capital letters A, B, C, D, E, F to small letters; we accept this comment and consider for the final submission.

Responses to Comments of Anonymous Referee #3

We respect and appreciate the comments given by the anonymous referee # 3; however, his /her comments do not look professional and expert in the field. For example, he stated “in general, I see no much relation between the title and many of the results and the discussions. Perhaps, because objectives are not properly enounced.” Whereas, as it is indicated in the paper, the objectives were properly stated and the title of the paper is very much related with results and discussion. We never missed these points since we are professional and expert in the field. Such comments weren’t given by the other two referees (referee 1 and 2).

Thanks

Alemayehu Adugna

Corresponding Author