

Interactive comment on “Lime and zinc application influence soil zinc availability, dry matter yield and zinc uptake by maize grown on Alfisols” by S. K. Behera et al..

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 7 October 2016

My overall assessment of this manuscript is that although it covers a subject of potential interest to the journal, it does it without a clear objective and combining information on subjects that are well proven (e.g. liming) and very little in others (such as in a more detailed discussion of the interaction among treatments).

I have indicated several comments in the annotated version of the manuscript, but I summarize here some major points in case the authors want to rework the manuscript for a possible resubmission.

1- The article lacks clear objectives, stated at the end of the introduction. There are apparently three overlapping studies: 1. Field experiments, greenhouse pot experiments, and effect of the extractant used in determining Zn concentration. However, it

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



is unclear how they are coordinated for a final objective, giving the impression of been three related (but not properly coordinated) experiments. The manuscript might be re-organized and edited, particularly in the introduction and M&Methods to address this problem.

2- There is missing some key information in the material and methods sections (for instance a better definition of the soil sampling in the field studies, or the properties of the manure, . . .). There are many other examples of these in the annotated version of the manuscript. They should be addressed.

3- There is duplication in results presented in the Tables and Graphs while at the same time the statistical models uses (and in their major results, particularly in the case of interactions between variables) This should be addressed.

4- The discussion and conclusions suffer the same lack of focus already mentioned in the overall organization for the manuscript. This should also been addressed-

For these reasons my recommendation is that the manuscript should be returned to the authors for major modifications before been reconsidered for possible publication.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.soil-discuss.net/soil-2016-41/soil-2016-41-RC2-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on SOIL Discuss., doi:10.5194/soil-2016-41, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

