

Interactive comment on “Investigation of the relationship between electrical conductivity (EC) of water and soil, and landform classes using fuzzy model and GIS” by M. Mokarram and D. Sathyamoorthy

M. Mokarram and D. Sathyamoorthy

m.mokarram.313@gmail.com

Received and published: 2 April 2016

Reply to Reviewer’s Comments

Title The Study area is not included and should be since this is a study case focusing on one specific area. Keywords: one keyword should be related to the study area The study area has been added to the titles and keywords.

Abstract I. 25 as a geomorphologist, it is not clear to me what “classes of landforms” means. It has been replaced by landform classification.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Introduction: 40-42 unclear, please rephrase I. This sentence has been corrected.

43-44 Repeating what was said before This sentence has been corrected.

44-46 too forced, please split the two ideas into two different sentences This sentence has been split two different sentences.

51-53 this is a scientific paper, please be direct and do not mention this kind of general information. People that will read your findings already know what GIS possibilities are. Avoid unnecessary information. This sentence has been removed.

I. 56 “more and more”??? This mistake has been removed.

59-60 and 60-62. Merge these two sentences. 68 and 71 avoid same constructions in consecutive sections . 71 “also” appears two times in the same sentence These amendments have been made.

Case study The Study area should include further information for the reader who is not familiar with the area (geology, water availability, human population/distribution, etc). These more information about case study has been added.

86 what about precipitation? I guess it is important for agriculture purposes. The information about rainfall has been added.

87 monthly or absolute values? I guess it is monthly, mention it. The monthly is correction that has been added.

92 is there any important city/village in the study area which should be included in the map? Figure 2 has been corrected.

human conditions? Mention them. Is the area under great human pressure? The information about it, I could not find.

97 space before “one” I. 97-98, this sentence is uncomplete. I would say, OK, and what? Please rephrase it. It was mistake that has been removed.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Result and Discussion section I found it very difficult to follow. It is very poor and mainly consists of figures, without accurate descriptions of their meaning. Moreover, and this is the weakest part of the manuscript, results are not discussed and compared with other similar studies and regions on Earth. This section needs to be rewritten and reorganized. Please, interpret and discuss your data, not just present it. 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. It has been improved.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2016-30/se-2016-30-AC2-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., doi:10.5194/se-2016-30, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

