

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_122933
Title of the Manuscript:	Improved diammonium phosphate from Tahoua natural phosphate and synthetic diammonium phosphate
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript describes some laboratory level experiments of mixing ammonium phosphate with rock phosphate. The manuscript does not constitute the content of real research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No comments	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract gives the information about the paper. However, results in terms of numbers make the abstract up to the level.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. 1. The introduction section does not introduce to the work the authors did. 2. The experimental section is incomplete 3. There should be proper information about the analysis methods used for the nutrient content. Information about the methods used in all the analysis are to be included	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is not scientifically acceptable. 1. The authors claim that they have prepared DAP by reacting ammonia with phosphoric acid. The reaction generally produces MAP first and then addition of more ammonia makes it convert to DAP. The manuscript does not even discuss that aspect. 2. The theory of rock phosphate reacting with another phosphate is really possible? The presence of excess phosphoric acid is not going help. 3. I am not at all convinced about the basics of the chemistry being discussed here.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are made to make the context of the paper only. Results are to be justified and compared with other existing research	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English language and sentence structure needs improvement	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		
	The manuscript cannot be considered as a research paper and needs to be rejected.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	P O Suresh
Department, University & Country	India