

Interactive comment on “Municipal solid waste open dumping, implication for land degradation” by M. Yazdani et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 26 May 2015

I have carefully read the manuscript and, in my opinion, it must be rejected at this stage. Some of the reasons for this recommendation are these:

[1] The manuscript hardly falls within the scope of Solid Earth.

[2] The English grammar and style need a deep revision.

[3] The title does not fit the main text.

[4] The introduction section is overlong, often chaotic and disordered. I encourage authors to structure this section in paragraphs following this sequence: [i] general overview, [ii] literature review, [iii] statement of the problem, research gaps and necessity of innovative methods and [iv] clearly enounced objectives. Some detailed comments on the introduction section are carried out in the attached document.

C705

[5] Material and methods are poorly described.

[6] Discussion is extremely poor. A graphical example: only 11 cited references concentrated in lines 13-17 (page 1108), 11 and 16-18 (page 1109), when the section is 40 lines long.

[7] Conclusions do not show the main consequences of the research carried out.

[8] Despite other important problems, references are not strictly written. There are lots of wrong authors and titles. Even some DOI numbers are absent (e.g., Al-Karaki, 2011) or wrong (e.g., Sumathi et al., 2008). Some detailed comments on references are listed in the attached document.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/7/C705/2015/sed-7-C705-2015-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., 7, 1097, 2015.

C706

Manuscript title: Municipal solid waste open dumping, Implication for land degradation

Authors: M. Yazdani, M. Monavari, G. A. Omrani, M. Shariat, and M. Hosseini

General comments

I have carefully read the manuscript and, in my opinion, it must be rejected at this stage. Some of the reasons for this recommendation are these:

1. The manuscript hardly falls within the scope of Solid Earth.
2. The English grammar and style need a deep revision.
3. The title does not fit the main text.
4. The Introduction section is overlong, often chaotic and disordered. I encourage authors to structure this section in paragraphs following this sequence: [i] general overview, [ii] literature review, [iii] statement of the problem, research gaps and necessity of innovative methods and [iv] clearly enounced objectives. Some detailed comments on the introduction section are listed below.
5. Material and methods are poorly described.
6. Discussion is extremely poor. A graphical example: only 11 cited references concentrated in lines 13-17 (page 1108), 11 and 16-18 (page 1109), when the section is 40 lines long.
7. Conclusions do not show the main consequences of the research carried out.
8. Despite other important problems, references are not strictly written. There are lots of wrong authors and titles. Even some DOI numbers are absent (e.g., Al-Karaki, 2011) or wrong (e.g., Sumathi et al., 2008). Some detailed comments on references are listed at the end of this document.

Detailed comments

Page	Line	Comment
1098	2	"MSW" not defined in the abstract.
	5	Re-write: "in Iran, standards".
	6	Check: "attended, evaluation an open dumping". Perhaps you mean "attended, and evaluation of open dumping"?
	7	What restrictions and troubles?
	10-11	Re-write: "Mazandaran province, northern Iran, and the southern coast of"
	9-12	Not clear, check. The suitability [...] is the significance [...].
	15-16	Re-write: "identified. Results indicate". This sentence is not clear, however.
	19-21	This statement is too general and imprecise. It is false for all developing countries. Perhaps, authors should delete it or describe the regional situation, but "developing countries" show many different situations.
	24	Avoid unnecessary capitals: "landfill".
	25-26	This statement needs revision and updated references. I have no doubt about the authors' exactitude, but the cited reference was published in 2006. In addition, Mahini and Gholamalifard (2006) are, in fact, citing Leao et al. (2004)

1

Fig. 1.

C707