

Interactive comment on “Impacts of conservation tillage on the hydrological and agronomic performance of *fanya juus* in the upper Blue Nile (Abbay) river basin” by M. Temesgen et al.

M. Rivers (Referee)

mrivers@iinet.net.au

Received and published: 29 February 2012

General Comments

Overall, this paper and the research that it describes are of a suitable standard for publication but will need some minor considerations and changes before the manuscript can be published. These are listed below in detail but, essentially: most references to figures were incorrect (numbers did not refer to the correct figures); statistical analysis of data was undertaken but the results of these analyses are not described in the Results section, and; further consideration could be made of the implications for this research at a broader scale.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Technical Comments

Numerous references to plant species were not italicised correctly – these need correcting. Similarly, most incidences of “et al” need to be corrected to “et al.” (in italics). Too numerous to describe individually. Most references to figures referred to the wrong figure. These need correcting. Too numerous to describe individually. P1087, Line 2: The FAO report is quite old (1986) and the figures for erosion may have changed, particularly given later comments regarding excessive rates of increase in eroded areas. P1088, Line 25: Change “doing” to “by undertaking”. P1089, Line 24: Change “by” to “at”. P1090, Line 8: italicise “in situ”. P1091, Line 4-5: The “15cm” and “10cm” descriptions are reversed in the figure referred to. Check and correct whichever is incorrect. P1091, Line 13-14: Were the fertiliser inputs the same across the trial sites? If so, this should be stated. If not then yield discussions need to be re-written. This is discussed marginally in S4. P1092, Line 3: Suggest replace “places” with “sites”. P1092, Line 4: Replace “penetrolgger” with “penetrologger”. P1092, Line 11: Replace “upstream” with “upslope”. Also “downstream” with “downslope” in Line 12. P1092, Line 21: Replace “weighted” with “weighed”. Section 3 Results and Discussion: Most references to differences in parameters between treatments aren't supported statistically. For example in S3.3 soil moisture in TT is stated as being “consistently higher” than CT but no statistical significances are stated. This needs to be considered in all sub-sections of S3. Section 4: This section should be expanded to consider the more general implications in this region (and perhaps others) of broader uptake of these practices. For example: how much more yield could be produced? What would the costs be?

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 9, 1085, 2012.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper