Solid Earth
Discussions
Open Access
EGU

Interactive comment on "Using ordered weight averaging (OWA) for multicriteria soil fertility evaluation by GIS (case study: southeastern Iran)" by Marzieh Mokarram and Majid Hojati

Dr Oliva (Referee)

oliva_marc@yahoo.com

The paper constitutes an interesting study about the evaluation of soil fertility in Iran. The study case is focused one of the most important centres of agriculture in this country. Consequently, a better understanding of the factors influencing soil fertility in this region may provide important guidelines to improve agriculture production for the entire country.

However, I have major concerns about the structure of this paper. Significant changes need to be made before being acceptable for publication in SOIL.

The Introduction is clear and well-supported. However, the structure of the following

sections is not clear. The Study Area should be immediately after the Introduction so that the reader can understand about the environmental conditions in the area before explaining what methods have been used for this study. Moreover, the study section needs to incorporate some basic information for the reader (climate conditions, water availability, geology, human pressure, etc). You have to consider than the reader is not familiar with the area and you need to provide all the basic information that influences agriculture production in your study site. Regarding the methods, you don't mention what strategy you followed when collecting the 45 samples and this should be clarified.

The Results and Discussion section is extensive and well-organized. However, this section is almost only Results. There is no interpretation of the results and the authors go straight to the conclusions. Results must be interpreted and discussed. What is new and different with respect to previous studies? Are similar/different approaches with similar/different results been implemented in other areas with similar environmental settings? Please support your results comparing your data with other similar studies around the world.

In conclusion, I would propose a structure as follows: - Introduction - Study Area - Materials and methods - Results - Discussion - Conclusions - Acknowledgements (I don't see any in the current version)

Figures and tables are enough and of good quality.

Abstract l. 16 space before "So" l. 16-17. This sentence says the same than the former one. Delete

Key words: study area should be included.