

Interactive comment on “Alleviating aluminium toxicity on an acid sulphate soils in Peninsular Malaysia with application of calcium silicate” by A. A. Elisa et al.

A. A. Elisa et al.

2138258488@mail.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Received and published: 9 February 2016

Dear Referee,

Thank you very much for your comments. I have made the correction. Kindly find the attachment on list of corrections and also supplement on the correction made in red font. Thank you.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/7/C1961/2016/sed-7-C1961-2016-supplement.pdf>

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., 7, 2903, 2015.

SED

7, C1961–C1963, 2016

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C1962



List of corrections

Comments from Anonymous Referee#2	Author response	Author's changes in manuscript
The first issue is the quality of English language and grammar, which is very poor. I strongly recommend revision by a native-English colleague or a professional scientific translation service. The greatest problems of this manuscript are grammar and style, and some sentences are not understandable (eg: "The release of Si to the acid sulphate soils increased their amount in the exchangeable form of nutrient"). Even if scientifically correct, the manuscript should not be published in these conditions.	Correction have been made (Appendix 1)	Whole manuscript
The abstract needs to be completely rewritten. The abstract must briefly state the background, your main objective, a general approach of methods and main results and conclusions. The first half of the abstract is some chaotic and should be rewritten.	Corrections have been made. -Abstract have been rewrite	2 (L2)
In addition to reviewing the language, the main text needs a thorough restructuring and revision. Firstly, I do not understand the objectives or they are not clearly expressed. It seems, as stated (page 2906, line 7), that the aim of this work is to increase production, but this subject is not touched beyond the introduction.	Corrections have been made. -The objectives of this study have been rewrite.	2 (L7), 4 (L11)
The description of the experiments needs to be completely revised and restructured. The number of samples taken is unknown. The reader does not know where they were collected, when (only the number of days between samplings is known) and why.	Corrections have been made	4 (L18)
Regarding the statistical analysis, the methods used are simple, but some measures of dispersion must be added. This would help to understand some results.	Corrections have been made	Figure 1, 2, 3, 4
Finally, I believe that this work may be summarized as follows: soil samples were collected and calcium silicate was added.	From the result, it shows that positive relationship between soil pH and Si ad 30D and 60D.	

Fig. 1.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

