



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology</a>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJB2T_40528  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Investigating the effectiveness between using <i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i> and its biosurfactant in bioremediation of petroleum hydrocarbon contaminated soil |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research Article   |

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: 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)   |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments |  |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduction: I'd suggest to include more recent reference (above year 2010) rather than 1990s. There are thousands of work similar to you research which could be cited such as "Arezoo Dadrasnia, Mohammed Maikudi Usman , Kelvin Swee Chuan Wei, Rita Devi Velappan , Hossein Jamali, Nooshin Mohebbi and Salmah Ismail. (2016). Native soil bacterial isolate in Malaysia exhibit a promising supplements on degrading organic pollutants. Process Safety and Environmental Protection. DOI: 10.1016/j.psep.2016/02.001."</li> <li>- What is the reason for incubating only 8 h/ day?! Why did not allow to incubate 24 h. If you have any reference for this method, please cite it. (Line 75)</li> <li>- Line 126; why kept the moisture of sample to 10%? Usually soil moisture keep for 60-80%. Please explain it.</li> <li>- How many replicate you used for your experiment?</li> <li>- Use error bar (standard deviation) for all figures.</li> <li>- How you going to justify the mechanism of degradation?</li> <li>- Have you done the physic-chemical analysis of soil (before &amp; after the experiment)?</li> <li>- Why stopped the experiment on day 40? Why did not continue for over 40 days? (why not 50 or 60 days)</li> </ul> | <p>Suggestion to include more recent reference above year 2010: I do not agree with this. Ground breaking discoveries and inventions were made in times past, even centuries ago. Do we throw away those discoveries and inventions because of new ones? Besides, many new discoveries were made while studying so called old works. Also, new technologies are built based on old ones from which the foundation was laid. No matter how old a work is, it will still contain its vital information relevant for others to build on.</p> <p>Re-read line 74 – 75 again! The culture was incubated for 7 days, but the shaker machine on which it was incubated was set into operation for 8 h per day. The statements in line 74-75 imply that the machine was operated for 8 h per day for a total of 7 days.</p> <p>With regards to your comment on Line 126, for bioremediation of oil polluted soils Thapa <i>et al.</i> (2012) cited a value of 30 to 90 %; Chorom <i>et al.</i> (2010) cited a value of 14 to 19 %. We can thus generalized that for bioremediation of oil contaminated soil the water content should be adjusted to values within the range of 14 to 90 % depending on the type of soil. The moisture content of the soils in my setups was kept at 10 – 15 %, and not just 10 %. Also based on the type of soil I used, 20 % moisture content turned it into slurry - a situation which was not part of the investigation.</p> <p>I have not come across bioremediation of crude oil polluted sites were replications of the sites were made. However, determinations of the bioremediation parameters were done in triplicates. For instance, If you observe Table 3 and 4 you would notice this.</p> <p>Why stopped the experiment on day 40? At day 35 the quantity of the THC have fallen below 5000 mg/Kg (or ppm); this is the target value set by the authorities in my country for bioremediation of crude oil contaminated environment. Thus the reason for not going beyond to 50 or 60.</p> <p>With regards to the other comments, I don't see how they add to the justification of the aim of this work.</p> |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    |  |   |