

SOIL Discuss., referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/soil-2021-125-RC2>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



Comment on soil-2021-125

Anonymous Referee #2

Referee comment on "Migration behavior of benzobicyclon hydrolysate and associated influencing factors in different agricultural soils" by Lang Liu et al., SOIL Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/soil-2021-125-RC2>, 2022

A study was carried out to investigate the migration behavior of benzobicyclon hydrolysate (BH) in different agricultural soil types and the associated influencing factors.

Overall, the paper was featured by several issues, thus suggesting its rejection.
In particular:

- grammar and writing style: the whole paper is affected by several grammatical issues with improper use of the scientific English style (see the syntax);

- Introduction: too long and not really focused on paper background;

- Materials and Methods: too questionable approaches. For example, authors collected soil samples from the Ap surface horizon (I suppose: 0–20 cm depth; NOT LAYER!) from four major rice-producing regions throughout China. However, as clearly shown by soil classification, this method introduced a significant variability that the authors do not take into account or justify in their results. Additionally, from a statistical analysis viewpoint, the authors just stated that "statistical analysis were performed in SPSS Statistics 22.0", without explaining which kind of data treatment they used. This is a dramatic issue since without explaining statistical approach and previous data pretreatment, this Reviewer, as every other serious Reviewer worldwide, cannot judge if obtained outcomes are affected by mistakes in data treatments;

- Results and Discussion: results and the following discussion are too speculative and very often justified by using very old references or without any comparison with previous studies. In this last case, this is not due to the novelty of the paper's outcomes but just, in this Reviewer's opinion, to the overspeculative comments of the authors.

For all of the aforementioned reasons and due to a low novelty in paper results, this Reviewer must suggest its rejection.