

Review of: "Analyzing the Effects of Organic Amendments on Soil Erosion Dynamics: A Comprehensive Study on Application Methods and Timing"

Bekele Lemma¹

¹ Hawassa University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I have reviewed the manuscript entitled "Analyzing the Effects of Organic Amendments on Soil Erosion Dynamics: A Comprehensive Study on Application." The author has a good deal of data in his manuscript and has attempted to interpret it. However, the manuscript can be improved by:

- i. Improving the write-up. The manuscript lacks a formal scientific writing style and requires professional input.
2. Restructuring the organization in many respects; for instance, under 3.2., sub-sections 3.2.1. Sand percentage, 3.2.2. Silt ... were not important. The interaction tables 5, 6, 7, must come before the main effects analysis results, and so on.
3. Organizing the results in a better way. In 3.2., changes in sand, silt, and clay, describe the main results.
4. Presenting the statement of the problem clearly. The introduction is weak; it does not make a strong case to justify the research. For instance, the researchers failed to emphasize the need for the research and why the treatments were chosen.
5. Avoiding repetitions. The data presented in the table are presented in the figures. Select one way of presenting the given data.
6. Describing in detail important points in your study, such as the preparation of soil amendments.
7. Selecting appropriate wording for the field. For instance, changes in sand, silt, and clay percentages or changes in particle size fractions. 'Following the application of the rainfall simulator' or 'Following the simulated rainfall ...' and so on.
8. Removing figures 2 and 3 and replacing them with a proper description and references.
9. Meticulously removing minor mistakes. Figure 1 appears to be a copy from another source. It appears you have two captions in the figure.
10. Indicating the soil type you are studying.
11. Reducing the number of tables. There are many tables, and most are larger (e.g., Tables 2 and 3), which are not suitable for comparison or publication. Data in tables is repeated in figures, and I prefer figures to tables unless the data presented is different.
12. Presenting P values in a bracket for significant results.
13. Improving the discussion.

14. Improving the language in general.

I recommend a major revision of the manuscript before it is considered for publication.