



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>



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors present simple study comparing various extraction procedures for assessment of available nutrients in soils. Although huge amount of the analyses was done, the text in present state is not ready for acceptance of the manuscript and I must recommend to reject the text because of following limitations: 1. The level of English language is poor and needs to be corrected by a native speaker. 2. The Introduction is very weakly written. The section present individual paragraphs copied from individual papers comparing the extracriion methods without any context and critical comparison of the previously published data. For example, the statements at the lines 49-54 are generally known but explanation how the soil properties can affect the element extractability is missing. Moreover, some findings from different authors are contradictory (Osemwota 2007 <i>versus</i> Matejovic and Durackova 1994) and no author's own opinion and evaluation was included.	The manuscript has been rewritten with most of the comments taken into consideration. It is however difficult to highlight the changes because they are numerous.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3. Only SI units are acceptable. 4. Analytical methods are weakly described, instrumentation should be specified, extraction methods have to be more detailed, instrumental parameters have to be mentioned 5. Figure 2 is redundant, the correlation coefficients should be mentioned in the text even if no significant correlation was found.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In principle, the novelty of the study is very limited. What new information it brings? The manuscript only compare the extraction efficiency of three known and frequently used extraction methods without any quality assurance of the data and without verification wheather the data represent really the plant-available portions of the nutrients.	Information on the used methods is important especially as there are many methods available. This work contributes to information on the methods of extraction especially when looking at the decision of a lab manager. What method will be chosen based on its advantages and draw backs.