



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_30830
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF WASTE ENGINE OIL ON THE MICROFLORA AND PHYSICO-CHEMICAL QUALITY OF SOILS FROM TWO WEST AFRICAN COUNTRIES
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Wrong reference style. This from the journal's website: References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [3]. Guideline for Reporting P values: P is always italicized and capitalized. i) Correct expression: ($P = .05$). Wrong Expression: ($P < .05$), unless $P < .001$ ii) The P value should be expressed to 2 digits whether or not it is significant. If $P < .01$, it should be expressed to 3 digits. iii) When rounding, 3 digits is acceptable if rounding would change the significance of a value (eg, $P = .049$ rounded to $.05$). Common names (mycoremediation, iron, zinc, sample, sulphate, fluorine, acenaphthene, etc.) are written with small letters. Decide if you are going to write physico-chemical (ln 7) or physicochemical (ln 178). Stick to one. Remember you are reporting on work already DONE, thus everything should be in PAST TENSE. Ln 17 ... parameters such as pH (much better than 'like'). Also ln 64, 74, 93 Ln 44 I suggest the following: The aim of this	Journal's reference style adopted. Thanks. Thanks for the guidelines. The tool applied was the software SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) (version 20) by analysis of variance on ranks to compare the means. Values were expressed to two digits. Thanks immensely for further highlights on this. I am grateful. This correction has been effected. Thanks. Corrected. Thanks. Tenses in entire manuscript corrected. Thanks. Your suggestion is taken. Thanks immensely.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	preliminary study was to investigate the effects of waste engine oil on the microflora and physicochemical quality of soil and which of the two sites, namely Owerri in Nigeria and Kumasi in Ghana had the highest level of contamination that could pose a matter of public health concern. Ln 53 – check spelling of Berte-Corti (different in ref list) Ln 57: ... humans ~~benefit~~ who suffer... Ln 65: Adam not in ref list Ln 69 ... growth for ~~awhile~~ a while or... Ln 74 Toledo 2006 in ref list Ln 77 You will have to check with the journal, but "Pic" may not be acceptable. Image would be more professional. Image 1 (Pic 1) is very unclear. Ln 82 check spelling and date of Mozuk – different in ref list Ln 115 Sample one (or 1) Methods – What was the trial layout? Did you have no repetitions? Which statistical analyses did you do? Which t-test (it seems your tables are the result of a t-test)? Which statistical programme did you use? Remember, anyone must be able to re-do your work. Lines 144-147 You need references for the methods Ln 149 ... samples were carried out ... Ln 152 according to this journal the Results and Discussion should be in one. It makes more sense. Now you list the results that anyone can read from the tables and figures. It is very confusing. If you discuss the results it makes for much better reading and understanding. Remember, the reader has only your paper as reference. Ln 162 mlog – this is not a recognised abbreviation. If you have to use abbreviations, you have to explain it the first time you use it. REMEMBER EVERYTHING	This has been corrected. The sentence has been amended. Thanks. Corrected. Amended. Image 1 which is unclear has been taken off. Thanks. Amended. Thanks. It was a randomized complete block design and there were replicates. The statistical analyses was SPSS, this information has been added. Thanks. The methodology is CABI Microbial Services, Egbam, Surrey United Kingdom in-house methods. They are acknowledged. Thanks. Corrected. Thanks. The discussion now follows the results. Thanks. The explanation has been given at first time use. Pls see Line 12. Thanks. NOTED. Units were given. I have highlighted them in yellow. Thanks. Samples CS-O and CS-K were the two
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	MUST BE REPORTED IN PAST TENSE Ln 178-198 You give many numbers but almost no units. You need to give the units. Ln 182 This does not make sense. The controls were the lowest but so was sample CS-O?? I suggest: The controls had the lowest (if it did) total hydrocarbon contents while sample CS-O was slightly higher, followed by CS-K with Your tables – is it really necessary to give all the characteristics of the bacteria? I would think that the genus and species would be sufficient. Anyone can find out the other characteristics from a microbiology book or the internet. Table 4: What is benzo-a-anthrace??? Ln 291: USEPA not in ref list Ln 294 et al or <i>et al.</i> Ln 307: Fen or Fan? Check spelling. Your discussion reads very difficult. Do not use “...” but report the work in your own words. You give way too much information from other work. You only need to say that these authors found the same results or not. Ln 321 Shekhar 2015 or 2014?? See ref list Ln 327 What is “normal” fungi or soil. Just call them fungi. I guess you mean unpolluted soil. Then call it that. In 333 You NEVER refer to yourself in an article. These reports corroborated the results of this study. Ln 336 <i>Rhizopus oryzae</i> Ln 365 In what way are the control soils of a higher quality? You didn't measure soil quality as such? Maybe just call it uncontaminated. Ln 368 utilizing or utilising line 376?? I believe this journal prefers the American spelling utilizing. Ln 404 pH value of 5.40 for both the control soil as well as a contaminated soil. If this is what you mean?	controls from the two locations that samples were collected. I have modified the table. Thanks. Pls, it is one of the PAHs. Amended. Thanks. Corrected. Thanks. Amended. Thanks. Correction taken and discussion amended. Thanks immensely. Corrected. Thanks. Ok. Thanks. Ok. Thanks. Corrected. Thanks. Ok. Thanks. I had to remove the sentence completely. Ok. Thanks immensely. Amended, thanks immensely.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		I am immensely grateful to the reviewer for quality time spent on this manuscript.