

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

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 13 August 2016

The aims and goals behind the paper are commendable and I expect that the paper will ultimately be publishable because its lofty goals and foresight research perspective. However, I feel that the paper would have benefit from a more early intervention to improve structure, table and figures prior to being available as a discussion paper. The paper clearly needs improvement in the organization of the results section, which currently split in 7 subsections some with only 2-4 lines, this give a very fragmented read of this section. It maybe better to have no subheadings at all this also shave at least 7 lines of the paper. 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. Figure 1 can go to supplementary material. For Figure 2 and 3 it be interesting to have

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



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. Clearly, 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. In short, the authors should improve the quality of the structure, figure and tables and streamline the main text. Can the focus maybe be more on those species which are actually presented in Fig. 1 and Fig 2. The revised version should be in a much better state for the review of the in depth scientific work described in the paper.

---

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

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

