



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012 IRJPAC 2600
Title of the Manuscript:	A comparative study on the use of Calcium Acetate Lactate, Calcium chloride and Acidic Ammonium Acetate- Ethylene Diaminetetra acetic acid (AAAc-EDTA) for the quantification of extractable, P, K and Mg from acidic soils.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The theme of the manuscript deals with the problem of nutrient extraction from acid soils located in Cameroon. The results comparing two extracting agents can be helpful for the practice in local conditions. Nevertheless, the manuscript needs many (especially formal) corrections. Some sentences are not clean (rows 25-27, row 196). The normality and molarity are used in the manuscript – use only one form (better molarity, normality is over). Please, check your text and English one more time (I recommend by native speaker), the main problems are following: The title of the manuscript: quantification???, quantification perhaps... Abstract: row 14: significantly correlated to soil pH... Row 15:... nutrients at a go thus...? Row 35: soil fineness – not suitable, better soil texture. Row 40: formatting Row 43: ..in the order Truog,>CAL>Olsen>Bray III>Warren and Cooke (Mamo et al., 2002) – the meaning of these symbols is not clean, there is zero informative value. Row 49: by Mutula in 2009 – by Matula Row 54: content (..... Row 69: ...of Cameroon which lies between – better ..of Cameroon situated between... Row 70: DTT0	The corrections have been done but it is difficult to highlight the corrected section because most sentences have been rephrased or changed completely.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Row 80: ...two methods methods each: Row 87: ...and read using..., better and analysed using.. Row 95: carbon. Row 101: ..by the various methods varied. Better - by the selected methods varied. Row 103: This could be attributed.... Row 192: The Nutrients.... (The nutrients) Row 193: ...independent on the ... Row 195: by CaCL2 and other methods Staugaitis (and other methods present Staugaitis and... Row 196: the relationship with pH were...(this sentence must be revised, is not clean). Row 214: time ns energy.?? Row 221: for analysis of the samples. REFERENCES: The list of references is absolutely unacceptable in present form. Some capitals of author names are with dots, some without (Ehabe E.E., Bidzanga N.L,...and many others), many spaces are missing (for example Canberra,Australia...row 241, ..Plant Soil Environ.58 etc...), The author full names are used sometimes (rows 257, 266, 271). Why italic letters are used (row 266, 267 and 268)? The reference of Schachtschabel (1954) has many mistakes – Das Pflanzenverfugbare...., seinecBestimmung???, Ztschr f Pflanzenernahrung???	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript brings some useful information and after serious major revision could be recommended for the publication.	