

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Comparison of wheat and safflower cultivation areas in terms of total carbon and some soil properties under semi-arid climate conditions” by B. Turgut

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 12 May 2015

Manuscripts submitted to SE at first undergo a rapid access review by the topical editor (initial manuscript evaluation), which is not meant to be a full scientific review. It is utilized to identify and sort out manuscripts with obvious major deficiencies in view of the above principal evaluation criteria. If they are not immediately rejected, they will be published on the Solid Earth Discussions (SED) website, the discussion forum of SE, where they are subject to full peer review and interactive public discussion.

In the full review and interactive discussion, the referees and other interested members of the scientific community are asked to take into account all of the following aspects:

1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of SE?

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



The paper mainly address relevant scientific questions within the scope of SE

2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data?

In many aspects, this manuscript shows existing concepts and new data

3. Are substantial conclusions reached? Yes,

4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined?

Results support the conclusions and interpretations

Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions?

5. Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? Yes,

6. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution?

The author sufficiently gives proper credit to related work and indicate their original contribution.

7. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? Yes,

8. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? Yes,

9. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? Well clear

10. Is the language fluent and precise? Sufficient

11. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? Defined clearly.

12. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? They are sufficiently explained, doesn't need.

13. Are the number and quality of references appropriate? Appropriate

SED

7, C641–C643, 2015

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



14. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? Surely appropriate.

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., 7, 1007, 2015.

SED

7, C641–C643, 2015

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C643

