

# ***Interactive comment on “Assessment of combating desertification strategies using the linear assignment method” by M. H. Sadeghravesh et al.***

## **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 4 February 2016

Dear authors,

Although your work presents an interesting approach for assessing and combating desertification, as far as it is now, it is not suitable for publication. This work is based on 'expert experience' and 'expert opinion' according to the authors, so I think there is a strong lack of science behind it. The main problem is ambiguous and so the main hypothesis and the way of answering each problem presented by the authors. The methodology should be revised and references are needed. It is very difficult to follow how the authors performed their work, and so it makes it difficult to apply in other areas of the world. Also, the results are difficult to follow as the way they are presented is chaotic, and so the discussion. I would like to point out two things:

Full screen / Esc

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



1) I encourage the authors to please revise the English. It is not possible to send for review and possible publication a paper in which this issue has not been taken into account. Repetitive expressions, bad use of commas, missing capital letters, etc. can be found all over the manuscript. See for instance Lines17-27 of the Introduction section.

2) References are missing all the way through the paper. Also, please check the guidelines of the Journal in order to know how to cite scientific work. As it is now it seems like the authors did not have this in mind.

I would like to recommend the authors to deeply revise their work and make it suitable for publication. The world (including the scientific community) needs to know what is happening nowadays in Iran and the nearby countries.

#### ABSTRACT:

Please provide in the abstract: 1) problem in Iran to be solved, 2) hypothesis of the work, 3) research area, 4) methodology used in order to check/solve the hypothesis, 5) results.

#### INTRODUCTION:

In this part you should give references to the reader about the problem you want to solve, or at least, the wanted you are presenting to the scientific community. To do so, please enter to the Web of Knowledge site, or look on Google Scholar for already published scientific work worldwide. Also, in the introduction section you have to present your hypothesis and the steps followed to solve it (steps that will be explain later on in the Methodology and Results section).

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS:

Here is where you have to present your study area and be extremely concise on the methodology you have followed. It needs to be so concise so other researchers in different parts of the world could apply it. For instance, in Line5 of the 'Study area'

[Full screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

section you talk about the 'Amberje classification'. What is this classification? It is not cited and it is not an international way of climate classification as Köppen. Also, the description is weak. More data to understand how the area is can be interesting. Pictures might help as well.

## DISCUSSION:

Weak, short and with lack of references. Here is where you have to link your results with other results presented by different scientist all over the world. Also, here is where you have to show the relevance of your findings and possible difficulties you had.

## CONCLUSIONS:

As they are now you need to just focus on your findings. Be concise and precise. I can see just a list of general things but without any scientific support behind.

## REFERENCES:

Please cite properly!

All the best

---

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., doi:10.5194/se-2015-133, 2016.

Full screen / Esc

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

