

Interactive comment on “Comparison of three measurement methods of saturated hydraulic conductivity” by C. Fallico et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 24 June 2006

Peer Review of “Comparison of Three Measurement Methods of Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity and Remarks on Possible Affecting Factors” (2006-0061).

The manuscript compares three methods for measuring saturated hydraulic conductivity in a sandy loam soil of highland in Italy. The subject matter of investigation undoubtedly is of interest to an audience of HESS. Notwithstanding the authors failed to analyze what is new in this study that contribute something new to the knowledge of Science. This point is of serious concern in making a publication decision as several workers (Herman et al., 2003; Lee et al., 1985; Reynolds et al., 2000) have published similar type of work. Moreover, the three methods are not comparable due to different boundary conditions and macropore heterogeneity. A huge variability is observed and no description (morphology and mineralogy) of the studied soil aggravate the problem

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

of high variability.

Also, in the manuscript submitted, the authors have presented the results of their investigation so poorly in style and language rendered it very difficult to judge on its scientific contents for suitability for publication. The arrangement of different sections is also confusing. Due to enormity of corrections needed in the manuscript, I am not able to list them here as it done normally with reviews of scientific articles. There are many paragraphs that consist of only one sentence. There are too many large sentences (>5-6 lines) with enormous numbers of 'comma' sign. There are enormous numbers of paragraphs and too many spelling mistakes. I propose to concise several paragraphs, to avoid repetitions and to reduce the conclusion section. In the conclusion section, use of sentences like "Line 23 of Page No. 1004 to Line 3 of Page No. 1005" may be avoided. In addition, how did the authors measure 'bio-pores' as mentioned in Table 1? I also propose to merge the related tables into a single table to reduce the number of tables. In the figures, there are no definitions of the symbols used.

If the authors wish for a resubmission they should take enough care while revising the manuscript for both clarity of language and presentation of facts so that audience may find interest and novelty out of this publication in the 21st Century. My overall assessment is that, the manuscript as it is submitted now is difficult to be fully assessed for its suitability for publication in HESS.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 987, 2006.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper