

Interactive comment on “The impact of soil preparation on the soil erosion rates under laboratory conditions” by A. Khaledi Darvishan et al.

A. Khaledi Darvishan et al.

a.khaledi@modares.ac.ir

Received and published: 7 August 2016

All the corrections have been highlighted in Red color. Best Regards

OVERALL COMMENT: I think that is work is quite interesting and direct, however, I think that the readability can be substantially improved as well as the discussion of its usefulness and the implications of the results. They are the main points to work. Please, review my detailed comments

Reviewer Comment 1) Abstract 1. Page 886, lines 1-4. Please, review this sentence, it does not make sense. You are describing weak points, I cannot see the advantages.

C2067

In this sentence, in fact, you should define its usefulness on the soil erosion studies. There is no information in the abstract about the use of rainfall simulators, however, this is crucial to clarify the topic of the manuscript. Please, the significance has to be placed after a name (soil preparation, in line 17). Author's response: It has been corrected.

Reviewer Comment 2) Introduction 2. I can imagine you mean “laboratory” studies – page 887, line 18 Author's response: It has been corrected.

Reviewer Comment 3) Page 888. It is important that you explained the advantages of the use of laboratory plots because from the text I cannot see any additional advantage to justify its application instead of natural plots. I cannot understand because you prefer laboratory plots despite the higher costs, effort, soil disturbances, etc. Author's response: It has been corrected.

Reviewer Comment 4) On the other hand, your objectives have to be accurately developed, because you only proved a range of 3 intensities. I think the context of the work must be more accurate. Why is important your work in the concrete context of your study conditions. Author's response: It has been explained in the text.

Reviewer Comment 5) M&M 5. Page 888– line 23, for the organic matter, I suggest the use of one decimal value. Author's response: It has been corrected.

Reviewer Comment 6) Page 888- line 24. I suggest removing this sentence “To achieve the study purposes” (because there is anything previously mentioned). Author's response: It has been corrected.

Reviewer Comment 7) Page 889- line 15. Please, separate the percentage in volumetric %. Author's response: It has been corrected.

Reviewer Comment 8) Line 889 – line 18. Please, clarify Intensity-Duration-Frequency. In addition, for the duration selected, provide the value of frequency of return period to knot ha context of the intensities. This is important to know the magnitude of rainfall

C2068

you considered. Author's response: It has been corrected.

Reviewer Comment 9) Page 890, line 4. Please, correct "coincide" –coincident. Author's response: It has been corrected.

Reviewer Comment 10) Page 890, line 10. Please, specify the variables and why you carried out this analysis. You have to link your objectives with M&M so each step must be justified. Author's response: It has been corrected.

Reviewer Comment 11) Results and Discussion 11. Results and Discussion should be presented together. Author's response: It has been corrected.

Reviewer Comment 12) Which are the implications of your results? The observed differences indicate that the use of laboratory plots are not appropriate? Author's response: It has been explained in the text.

Reviewer Comment 13) Conclusions 13. Please, correct It0s – It is : : : Author's response: It has been corrected.

Reviewer Comment 14) Figures In Figure 4, two decimal values are not needed. Author's response: It has been corrected.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/7/C2067/2016/sed-7-C2067-2016-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., 7, 885, 2015.