

Interactive comment on “Potential for agricultural production on disturbed soils mined for apatite using legumes and beneficial microbe” by R. Swift et al.

R. Swift et al.

jmccomb@murdoch.edu.au

Received and published: 30 September 2016

Referee 2 comments and responses It maybe better to have no subheadings (in the Results section) We have reluctantly removed the subheadings

The information in Table 1 to 3 is nearly effective captured as text. Table 2 is nearly already describe in the materials and method section anyhow. We feel Tables 1-3 are core material and do not belong in the supplementary material.

Figure 1 can go to supplementary material. We have shifted the nodule rating figure into the supplementary material. Note also the caption for category 10 has been modified.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



For Figure 2 and 3 (now Figs 1 & 2) it be interesting to have the information if differences are significant or not. It not significant maybe a selection can be made of those with are and the others referred to in the text simple as not significant between treatment or species. We mention in the text which treatments are significant. Adding letters to the figures would be messy as the figures are already very busy. The referee seems to suggest using only a few plant species in the figures but this means that we would not be able to compare between weeks 9 and 18 as there are differences we talk about between the 2 different sampling periods. We have included the statistical analysis as a supplementary table for clarification and feel this is better than cluttering up the Figure.

Can the focus maybe be more on those species which are actually presented in Fig. 1 and Fig 2. We feel the emphasis is adequate

, some water damage occurred during the first sampling period, important that this was highlighted and also that damaged area were excluded from the statistical data analysis. However, it is not clear which one or how many species and replicates were in fact removed Now detailed pg 5 line 7

Editors comments Figures better in colour adopted

Insert more recent references References added Bacon and White 2016 Tokar et al. 2016 Gillespie et al. 2015 Yang et al. 2014

Interactive comment on SOIL Discuss., doi:10.5194/soil-2016-33, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

