

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_115084
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of saturated hydraulic conductivity under the reclaimed conditions of salt affected soil
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Abstract Evaluation:</p> <p>Clarity and Focus:</p> <p>The abstract provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, and findings.</p> <p>The objectives of the study are clearly stated: identifying salt-affected soil and investigating reclamation methods.</p> <p>The methodology is outlined succinctly, including soil sampling, analysis, and experimental procedures.</p> <p>The findings regarding the identification of soil problems and the effectiveness of different reclamation methods are summarized effectively.</p> <p>Content and Relevance:</p> <p>The study addresses an important agricultural issue: soil salinity affecting plant growth and soil permeability.</p> <p>The investigation focuses on a specific location, Thein Gone Village in Myanmar, which adds relevance to the study.</p> <p>Key soil properties such as texture, bulk density, pH, electrical conductivity, and sodium absorption ratio are analyzed, which are crucial for understanding soil health and salinity issues.</p> <p>The study evaluates different reclamation methods, including gypsum, sulfur, and cow dung manure, which are commonly used for soil remediation.</p> <p>Methodology Overview:</p> <p>The abstract provides a brief overview of the methodology, including soil sampling, laboratory analyses, leaching requirement calculation, and reclamation experiments.</p> <p>The use of statistical analysis for data interpretation adds credibility to the study's findings.</p> <p>Findings and Implications:</p> <p>The abstract summarizes the findings related to soil identification, leaching requirements, and the effects of different reclamation methods on soil permeability effectively.</p> <p>The implication that gypsum application at 5 t ha⁻¹ resulted in the fastest improvement in soil</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>permeability provides practical insights for agricultural practitioners facing similar soil issues.</p> <p>The abstract emphasizes the importance of drainage to prevent the formation of saline-sodic soil, which highlights the holistic approach needed for soil management in salt-affected areas.</p> <p>Language and Structure:</p> <p>The abstract is well-structured, with clear headings delineating each section.</p> <p>Language use is technical but accessible, making it suitable for both researchers and practitioners in the field of soil science and agriculture.</p> <p>There are no apparent grammatical or syntactical issues.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <p>Including a brief statement on the limitations of the study or areas for future research could enhance the completeness of the abstract.</p> <p>Providing a concise summary of the practical implications of the findings for farmers or policymakers could make the abstract more impactful.</p> <p>Overall, the abstract effectively communicates the study's objectives, methodology, findings, and implications, making it a valuable contribution to the understanding and management of salt-affected soils in agricultural settings.</p>	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.7

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Lack of Contextualization:</p> <p>The abstract lacks broader context or background information on the global significance of soil salinity issues or the specific challenges faced by agricultural communities in Myanmar. Providing this context could help readers understand the broader implications of the study.</p> <p>Limited Generalizability:</p> <p>The study focuses on a specific geographical location, Thein Gone Village in Myanmar, and may lack generalizability to other regions with different soil characteristics, climatic conditions, or agricultural practices. This limits the applicability of the findings beyond the study area.</p> <p>Incomplete Data Presentation:</p> <p>Some essential data, such as the actual values of saturated hydraulic conductivity (Ks) under different treatments, are mentioned only briefly without detailed presentation or analysis. Providing comprehensive data tables or figures could enhance the transparency and reproducibility of the study.</p> <p>Methodological Limitations:</p> <p>The abstract does not address potential limitations or challenges encountered during the study, such as sample size limitations, variability in field conditions, or uncertainties in laboratory analyses. Acknowledging these limitations could improve the credibility of the findings and interpretations.</p> <p>Insufficient Discussion of Implications:</p> <p>While the abstract briefly mentions the implications of the findings for agricultural practices, it does not delve into the broader socio-economic or environmental implications of soil salinity issues and their management. Including a more robust discussion of these implications could enrich the relevance and significance of the study.</p> <p>Language Complexity:</p> <p>Some technical terms and jargon may be challenging for readers without a background in soil science or agriculture to understand. Simplifying the language or providing explanations for specialized terminology could improve accessibility and readability.</p> <p>Structural Inconsistencies:</p> <p>The abstract could benefit from a more consistent structure, with each section following a standardized format. This would enhance clarity and facilitate easier navigation for readers.</p> <p>Incomplete Conclusion:</p> <p>The conclusion of the abstract summarizes the findings but lacks a clear statement on the broader implications or recommendations for future research or practical applications. A more robust conclusion could provide closure and guidance for readers.</p> <p>Addressing these shortcomings could enhance the overall clarity, rigor, and relevance of the abstract, thereby improving its contribution to the field of soil science and agricultural research.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shahad Mattar AL-Yaqoubi
Department, University & Country	Sultan Qaboos University, Oman