Reviewer 2

Authors must highlight the most important findings and avoid including too much information of data in the abstract.

We thank the reviewer for this. We have reviewed the abstract again, shortened it to 245 (from 264 words) (Line 27 and 28). Only the important findings are provided and some important data used to support these. The current abstract is absolutely not loaded with data.

The MATERIALS AND METHODS section has not been organized properly. The section 2.4 "Soil characterization" must be presented at the beginning of the section 2. The analysis of the soils represents a basis for the subsequent studies conducted on this soil (Tables 1, 2, 3).

We appreciate this suggestion. Section 2.4 "Soil Characterization" has been moved to the beginning as section 2.2.

Furthermore, the Table 2 has been cited before in section 2.2 without further comments. I strongly recommend introducing these data at the beginning of the section of M&M. As a consequence, the section 3.1 commenting these properties must be presented on the M&M.

Table 2 mentioned has been deleted (it was a mistake). The new arrangement of the sections in Materials and Methods is more reasonable and we appreciate the suggestion. Section 3.1 "Soil Characteristics" is right to be under Results and Discussions.

In the RESULTS AND DISCUSSION section the authors present a large number of data in the text and it is not clear if they are different or not from those presented in Tables and figures. Please, avoid to present repetitive and confusing information.

We appreciate the reviewer's views here. However, this doesn't seem to be the case. We have reviewed the results and discussion section and the information presented in the text under these sections is only those needed to highlight and explain the findings and a conscious effort was made to avoid repeating the information presented in the tables and figures. Efforts have also been made to remove irrelevant words to make these sections more concise (line 192 to 194).

In general, the different soils have not been considered for statistical analysis as well as for the discussion by justifying this the sentence "The result is presented as the averages for all soils within each depth examined because examination of individual soils showed no justifiable difference or pattern among the soils that worth focusing our discussions on. Comparison was made between the chelated and non-chelated micronutrient treatments". I do not agree with this fact. The results obtained for the different soils are not always similar and the soil characteristics presented in table 1, 2, and 3 are different when comparing the soils. I strongly suggest to perform a proper statistical analysis and discussing the results considering also the different soils.

We thank the reviewer for this contribution. To clarify this, individual soils were obviously examined and we agree the soils may vary in properties. However, there was no much difference in Cu fixation among the soils that could be ascribed to the differences in the soil properties. Thus, we believe it is more informative to the readers to present the findings here as averages of all the soils (but still showing the various depths). Doing this helps us to avoid presenting information that are not relevant and it makes the work a little easier to follow. So we have already done what the reviewer is suggesting but presenting it that way will be of no relevance. We however thank the reviewer for this suggestion.

In Table 4, authors present the results obtained at two periods despite a wide range of samplings were done. Please, explain the reason of this fact or present all the data.

We thank the reviewer for this observation. To clarify this, one of the goals of this study and which we think it's an improvement over previous studies, was the comparison of the chelated and non-chelated systems at short term and long term. To examine this, we selected the first 14 days to be used for the short term examination and the fixation after 90 days to be used for the long-term evaluation, and these were summarized in Table 4. The other days (2, 5, 7, 21, 28, 35, 49, 63, and 77d) examined were used in the kinetic models (section 3.4). So, the two days (days 14 and 90) were selected for a purpose. The subheading has been modified to "3.2 Copper fixation pattern (short and long-term examination)" to properly reflect our intention here.

In page 2884 L-4 authors justify the Cu losses in the chelated treated soil due to a degradation of the EDTA. The EDTA is not a biodegradable chelating agent. Reference given (Meers et al. (2005), clearly explain this fact while presenting other ligand, the EDDS, as the biodegradable one. Possible, the competence with other elements such as Ca is one of the main responsible of the Cu loses. Please, check references for this.

We appreciate this contribution. We have checked the reference for this again and we agree with the suggestion of the reviewer and thus have removed the phrase "as a result of biodegradability" (line 234). The other information presented in the text about EDTA (e.g. the half-life) is right.

Despite the study conducted on the competition of Cu with other micronutrients is really interesting, the results have not been presented in the best way. The Table 5 is confusing. The presentation of Pearson0s r correlations and significance could be more convenient. For indicating the level of significance the symbols with * may be more convenient too.

We thank the reviewer for this contribution. However, we do not understand what is wrong with Table 5 as the reviewer attempts to point out. Nevertheless, we have looked at Table 5 again and the text and made sure the information is right and well presented. The symbol (*) suggested by the reviewer is already used in the table.

In Section 3.4, the Table 7 is not mentioned correctly (Table 9 was written instead). I recommend to reduce the information presented in this section. It is interesting that the authors adjust the data to different models but, by presenting only the most suitable models more clear for the readers will be in order to understand the kinetics of the Cu fixation.

We thank the reviewer for this observation. This has been corrected to Table 7 (and not Table 9) (line 276).

We also think that showing how the data fit to the different models examined as presented in the figures will help the readers visualize the findings better. So please we will like to maintain the figures as presented since they are more informative that way.

Other technical comments:

The SI in the units is recommended (as eg. Avoid the use of gallon or wk, without further explanation).

Gallon has been converted to liter (line 135) and days (d) is used in place of week (wk) (lines 137 and 153).

Page 2879 – L 10. "Multiple spots" are not a proper reference

This has been changed to "approximately 12-15 spots" (line 114)