



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_22084
Title of the Manuscript:	ANIONS AND TOTAL PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS IN SOILS OF ABA DUMPSITES.
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The title of the article doesn't reflect the core work of the study. Abstract is very primitive and does not clearly represent the study. The manuscript need through revision for grammatical mistakes, unit's representation, and written in very compound and poor sentences. Introduction and experimental plan and described are poorly represented in the article. Results are poorly described without proper discussion with suitable references GC graph is absent Some terms like NINL are not written with full form. The legends for the figures are poorly written.	Noted and title has been slightly modified Noted and abstract has been slightly modified Noted and manuscript has been greatly improved upon Noted and improvement made Noted but GC graph not very necessary Agreed and modified
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Authors should check the unit representation and spelling mistakes along caps for the first letter of sentence	Noted
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Though the study conducted was not bad but on the basis of present presentation and insufficient data for a research article can be rejected for publication. Here by I recommend to publish this article as short communication only after through revision.	Did not agree