

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “CO₂ emission and structural characteristics of two calcareous soils amended with municipal solid waste and plant residue” by N. Yazdanpanah

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 5 December 2015

1.Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of SE? Yes.
2.Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? No. 3.Are substantial conclusions reached? Yes. 4.Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? Yes. 5.Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? Yes. 6.Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? Yes. 7.Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? No clear in the present format. They have to highlight what is novel/new from their contribution compared to previous researchers. 8.Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? Yes. 9.Does the abstract provide a concise

C1495

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



and complete summary? Yes. 10. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? Yes. 11. Is the language fluent and precise? It still needs some improvement in the English style and grammar. 12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? No applicable. 13. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? No. 14. Are the number and quality of references appropriate? Yes. 15. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? No applicable.

Comments on format

122. ..were under fallow 124-125: Where are the results for the article size distribution? 125-129: Move to the results section 132-133: Please insert a comma before “as well as” and “were”. It will show as: “In this study, two organic inputs from different sources, as well as C:N ratios including 132 urban MSW compost and alfalfa residue (AR), were applied.” 141. It says: “As is clear” it should say “As it is observed” 187-188: . It says: “..since it do not allow..” it should say “since it does not allow..” 209: It says: “..caused to significant ..”..” it should say “caused significant..” 230-233. Please, add commas to this paragraph “The values of microbial respiration for 10 Mg ha⁻¹ and 30 Mg ha⁻¹ application rates of MSW were respectively 2 and 3 times higher in the loamy sand soil and 2.1 and 3.3 times higher in the clay loam soil than those values obtained for unamended soils.” 239: It says: “..caused to ...”. it should say “caused ..” 249. It says: “Following 10..” it should say “ For the 10..” 264: It says: “Depends on the type..” it should say “caused ..” Depending on the type..” 281: It says: “in both the soils..” it should say “in both soils ..” 288: It says: “..caused to ...”. it should say “caused ..”. Please check this mistake throughout the text. 295: It says: “found to increase the SOC concentration..” it should say “increased the SOC concentration..” 298: It says: “.. It is apparent from the result..” it should say “.. It is seen..” 300-305. Please rewrite the following text. “Regarding the differences between chemical composition of 300 amendments, the organic carbon content of AR (468 g kg⁻¹) was more than the organic 301 carbon of MSW (394 g kg⁻¹), meanwhile the C:N ratio of

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment

AR-treated soils was more than 302 the C:N ratio of MSW-treated soils (Table 2). In other words, depends on the chemical 303 composition and C:N ratio of amendments, different amounts of organic carbon had been 304 finally added to the soils.”. it is unclear. 306: It says: “.. applications rate of..” it should say “..application rate of..” 320. It says: “.. attributed to this fact” it should say “..attributed to the fact ...” 377. It says: “.. ...” amendments used ” it should say “....” amendments...” 389: It says: “This finding has been approved by Jarvis (2007) who characterized the macro pores by high temporal variability.” Do you mean that Jarvis has observed the same results? 401. It says: “.. can be contribute” it should say “..can contribute...” 412. It says: “.. . It says: “The use of MSW and AR found to improve” it should say “The use of MSW and AR improved”. 421-422. It says: “the soil porosity especially macro pores fraction influences on the soil microbial respiration and carbon mineralization.” It should say “the soil porosity, especially macro pores fraction, influenced the soil microbial respiration and carbon mineralization.

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., 7, 3151, 2015.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)