



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_44122
Title of the Manuscript:	Variance in Protease, Dehydrogenase, Phosphatase and Respiratory Activities during Phytoremediation of Crude Oil Polluted Agricultural Soil Using <i>Schwenkia americana</i> and <i>Spermacoce ocymoides</i>
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The work is important publication to clarify the plant action in phytoremediation and proteases, phosphatases enzymes' role.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	2.1 (p.4) table 1 it is important the author explain why the before time have same mean and the same standard deviation. 2.2. (p.5) table 2 it is important the author explain why the before time have same mean and the same standard deviation. 2.3 (p.5) table 3 it is important the author explain why the before time have same mean and the same standard deviation. 2.4 (p.6) table 4 is important the author explain why the before time have same mean and the same standard deviation. 2.5 (p.6) table 6 it is important the author explain why the before time have same mean and the same standard deviation.	The before time mean and the standard deviations were same because the soil samples were first collected for baseline analyses before they were potted into containers individual containers.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I suggest to the author consider the possibility to make an English review with an English language specialist.	Ok.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	