



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_39768
Title of the Manuscript:	Physico-chemical Parameters of Fallowing Farmland Soils as it Affects Geohelminthes in Isiodu, Emohua Local Government Area, Rivers State, 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>)

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	Abstract: The results presented in abstract is different from the result section; the research was carried out in 2013/2014 and being reported in 2018. The situation in that local area may have changed and presentation this not reflect the current situation in that community Materials and Methods: Physico-chemical methods are okay, but the microscopic examination are faulty because; 1. You cannot get the eggs of <i>Strongyloides stercoralis</i> from soil, 2. You cannot use microscopic examination to differentiate Hookworms: <i>N. americanus</i> and <i>A. duodenale</i> 3. No bases was presented on differentiating plant helminthes Result : tables are not well organizes, too many information on the tables Discussion: This should start with the results obtained before comparing with what others have obtained	240 samples were collected during the study, but the results presented are averages of 2013 and 2014. $240 \div 2$ is 120, $74 \div 120 \times 100$ is 61.6%. I have rewritten the beginning I understand, it was as a result of lack of funds for publication, besides some parts of this work has been published in two other journals. This is the third one. 1. I never said I did. 2. The species of hookworm here is <i>A. duodenale</i> 3. No. Results: other reviewers don't think so Discussion: Ok.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Lots of grammatical errors, article need to be rewritten before it can be consider for publication.	