

Interactive comment on “Suitability of soil bioengineering techniques in Central America: a case study in Nicaragua” by A. Petrone and F. Preti

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 24 March 2008

Interactive Comments on “Suitability of soil bioengineering in Central America” by A. Petrone and F. Preti

In the present scenario, for the sustainable watershed management especially in the third world countries, soil bioengineering techniques seems to be more appropriate for economic efficiency. In this context this paper is relevant.

Specific comments:

1. Abstract does not reflect the summary and results of the work. 2. Lines 13-15, page 383; it is mentioned that the cuttings were collected from 9 plants, 7 plants, 4 plants etc., Is there any importance in these figures? Why there is variation in sampling? Is there any difference in cuttings obtained from different plants? Are they affect the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



survival rate? 3. Lines 3-4, page 384; after which, between 28, 29 and 30 January. Do you mean it is the time the plants were transferred to site? 4. Line 9, page 384; give a small description about the arrangements done to make it homogeneous. 5. Line 12, page 384; instead of saying certain parameters, mention the parameters which can be used for measuring plant growth and also explain why you selected only these three parameters. 6. The figure captions do not match with the explanations given in the text. Example: figure 5, 10. 7. Line 14, page 381; have you made any comparison of the results obtained from two sites? 8. 3.3 and 3.4, page 386; does not explain anything regarding the observations and the results. 9. Line 10, page 387; among the various possible causes..?, what are the other possible causes? Why do you think that the cause of failure is transportation damage? Is it because of the distance to the site? Is their any relation to the soil condition or climatic conditions? 10. 4.1, page 387; cost comparison is not clear. 11. Conclusion shall include the findings of the study.

General comments:

1. figure captions should match with that referred in text 2. Superimposing figures 2 & 9, may give a clear idea of how the growth of plants varies with precipitation. 3. Structure of the paper needs improvement with respect to the observations, comparison, analyses and then discussion.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 5, 379, 2008.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

