

Reviewers	First review	Response of Author on first review	Editor's comment
Chi	Posed issue with the source of the crude oil and duration of the study.	Author has provided explanation and made changes	No comments
Meh	Made several comments on different sections.	Author responded to most of the comments	No comments
Hpd	Update of review of literature is essential. Till date many advancement is taken place in bioremediation. Author, though tries to describe his findings in lucidity but I don't find novelty in the paper. The experimental design should be expanded minimum ten with a minimum of three separate assignments. Based on the new data the author has to support his findings with statistical analysis. Besides this the degree of loss of crude oil (light Nigerian oil) in complete degradation/mineralization needs to be supported with different bioassay's and soil biological characters. Moreover, I don't find link between isolation of crude oil degrading bacteria and amendment of M. Oleifera.		Not fully agree with reviewer that there is no link between crude oil degradation and presence of seed. But it is the presentation by the author that makes following this article extremely difficult and from that standpoint I don't blame the reviewer
Ahm	It is suggested that topic of research need to be modified (see comment). The methodology need to be re-visited and referenced properly! The only table is completely flawed (to be re-organised). Expertise of work done was archaic! Figures used are generally satisfactory. Concept of research is good.	Author claimed to have responded to the comments	I completely agree with the reviewer. Even in the revised version significant work is needed. Flow of the article is hard to follow. The way the results have been described is truly archaic. Crude oil biodegradation count method (2.3 section) too difficult to understand. Author needs to

Reviewers	First review	Response of Author on first review	Editor's comment
			describe lot more about it. How was the initial crude oil weight measured in 3gm of oil collected? Why in Figure-1 sample A which is the control showed so much growth of microorganism? What is the significance of pH change? Is it just due to the fact that the seeds are present? Why it is relevant?
Chr	Abstract: Conclusion should not come ahead of objective of research Mat and methods: Four different plastics will be labelled A-D not A-C, 2kg soil is relatively small soil to absorb 200ml of crude oil and perhaps 250ml water-there will be little or no aeration. No replication in this expt, the exptal units too small. The treatment is quite confusing, cannot understand why uncontaminated soil should serve as control instead of Moringa seed cake unamended soil since it is the treatment being investigated. The method used for the determination of crude oil degraded and cannot be relied upon. Other biochemical processes could increase or decrease the original soil sample. There are other reliable technologies used in the measurement of TPH i.e. chromatography, spectrometry etc.		The author has addressed most of reviewers comment. I can understand the lack of scope of using sophisticated techniques. But the author needs to focus more on careful management of the result and discussion section. The p-value turned out to be 0.068 (>0.05). In order for sample B & C to be different the P-value has to be <0.05 if the author is trying to establish the difference at 95% confidence level. So from that sense the conclusion is not clear to me.

Reviewers	First review	Response of Author on first review	Editor's comment
	Results and discussion. Physicochemical instead of physiochemical Table 1. explains the constituents or properties of M.oleifera seed cake? How were they able to determine total aerobic bacteria and crude oil utilizing bacteria as a property of seed cake		