



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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Manuscript was very poorly and perhaps hastily put together. It is recommended that authors take time to revise the manuscript properly and arrange the different sections before submission. 2. There were numerous typing, technical and presentation errors. In some cases, methodology was not detailed or sufficient to arrive at stated results and conclusions. For example, the authors stated that that the control soil received 0 ml of POME. This is difficult to understand. Should it not be a specified volume of distilled water or something else to enable comparison to be drawn against graded concentrations of POME. 3. Secondly, The use of Bergy's manual or cultural and morphological attributes to identify organisms is at best speculative. The authors did not admit this in discussing their results. 4. Thirdly, how was the moisture content of soil samples in the respective treatments maintained?? How did the authors determine the level of significance in results from the different treatments?? 5. Palm oil mill effluent should be abbreviated as POME throughout manuscript after it was first described in full in line 52. Check line 56, 59, 60, 78, 88, 210, 277, 279 etc., 6. In line 108-110, the author/s described the use of "sterile water" in dissolving the soil sample. What diluent was then used in the serial dilution??? What is "sterile water"?? Do you mean sterile distilled water, sterile tap water or sterile saline water??? They don't mean the same thing!!	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	7. Significant differences written as $P < 0.05$. Check and correct everywhere in the manuscript. 8. 1000L and above should be written as 1L etc., 500mL to be 0.5L 9. What is the symbol for the potency of hydrogen? pH or PH. Check table 4 and elsewhere in the manuscript. 10. Colony forming unit is abbreviated 'cfu' not 'Cfu' please!!!! 11. There's so much wrong the manuscript. Pls let someone conversant with scientific writing go through before re-submission.	
Minor REVISION comments	Authors should separate letters from their units eg, 10g should be 10 g. 24 hours should be 24 h. 100ml should be 100 ml and so on. Author should consider writing POME in abbreviation after the full meaning had been introduced in line 52. The reason for the initial letter capital in the stated location is not known.	
Optional/General comments	The entire language structure of the manuscript need to be comprehensively reworked and improved. Line 5 to 8 is vague and badly stated. Same as 11 to 15. The repetitive use of 'total heterotrophic' is clumsy and lacks fluidity of language and style. Line 18 to 24 should be restructured!!	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Charles O. Nwuche
Department, University & Country	Microbiology, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria