

***Interactive comment on* “Formation and characteristics of an Ultisol in Peninsular Malaysia utilized for oil palm production” by Arolu Ayanda Fatai et al.**

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 5 September 2017

Dear Editor,

1. the manuscript have several significant flaws, some are highlighted as below. to start with, is the abstract that does not support the study at the least. 2. the study objectives stated are very confusing. in the title the objectives are stated as, formation and characteristics. in the abstract it is stated the determine the characteristics and fertility. in the introduction, stated as formation and physico-chemical properties. which one which is the focus? 3. study area is not clearly designated. 4. soil sampling not stated in clear manner. how many samples were collected to justify the chemical/physical/mineralogical characteristics? 5. what is meant by conventional soil sam-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



pling? 6. the author stated that based on colour and texture, the soil is mainly one series only. how did the author come to such a conclusion using 2 parameters only? 7. scientific method and references are not clearly stated. 8. pg.10, Figure 4. unacceptable. the fundamental of soil description is highly flawed. the use of machinery clearly demarcate the horizon. the measure tape is not properly indicative of the soil depth and etc. Only one (1) soil pit for Ultisols used in this study? 9. the author stated Jempol Series? This is likely based on local soil series. what is the international equivalent (classification) of this series based on USDA Soil Taxonomy? how did the author come to the conclusion of Jempol Series? Comparative data from past study is missing. 10. Based on what soil suitability study was conducted? The representation and explanation was not sufficient and supportive at the least. 11. Grammar and syntax error throughout the manuscript. 12. References format, and please re-check.

Many more flaws are noted in the results and discussion. However, not pertinent in explaining any further than above.

Thus, unfortunately, the paper is recommended to be rejected.

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2017-60>, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

