



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_33015
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Palm Oil Mill Effluent on Soil Microflora and Fertility in Calabar – Nigeria
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Give a sentence on the background of the work in the introductory statement of the abstract. A lot of spelling mistakes in the text which should be corrected. For example the spelling of palm oil on the lists of keywords is wrong. The aim and objective of the study is not clearly brought out. It should be stated in the last paragraph of the introduction. The experimental design is wrongly conceived. It should be stated if the randomized complete block designed or completely randomized designed or split plot designed etc. It should be stated and explained fully. The authors should reconciled the quantity of soil used for the experiment, under soil sample they mentioned 5kg of soil used and under pollution of the soil sample, they mentioned 4kg of soil used. Which methodology was employed for the microbial analysis? Please explain in detail and give references. The materials and methods lack references? Methods used for enumeration of bacteria, fungi and actinomycetes are they novel or have they been done by other scientists and published? Please correct	Corrections effected. Corrections effected. Corrections effected Corrections effected. Corrected. Corrected. Corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Accordingly. Representative colonies of fungal isolates were characterized and identified based on their 144 cultural and morphological features. How was this done? It is not clear, and no reference was provided for repetition of the work. Soil pH and electrical conductivity should be referenced.	Corrected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	All punctuation marks should be respected e.g line 8 there should be a comma after soil pH. 277, there should be a full stop before there Line 467 on the reference section should be edited appropriately.	Corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		