



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_39810
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF FUEL OF ELECTRIC POWER GENERATORS ON SOIL PROPERTIES
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1- What is the type of the experimental design? 2- How many replications were used in this experimental design? 3- Why the authors did not use alphabetic superscript letters for distinguish between significant and non-significant values of parameters in tables 1-3? 4- Why the authors have not explain figures 1- 8? It would be better if authors could combine figures 1 to 8 and demonstrate them in one single figure. 5- Rephrase the results and discussions part by means of scientific and grammatical errors. 6- Indicate units for "moisture" and "bulk density" 7- In table 3, Which types of P values were used in "P" column?(1% or 5%) 8- In table 3, the p values of bulk density was 0.004 and in decision column got "NS" which is incorrect. 9- In table 3 the p values of particle size distribution for percentage of sand was 0.003 and in decision column got "NS" which is incorrect. 10- In table 3 the p values of particle size distribution for percentage of silt was 0.056 and in decision column got "S". Is it correct? 11- Conclusion and recommendation part should be written based on analysed data which is not done in this manuscript.	1- The experimental design employed during the course of the study has been captured; 2- The replications used for the soil samples taken in 5 locations/sites in each of the environments used was three (in triplicates); 3- The authors have distinguished variation in the results by using ANOVA on the variation in the mean values of the parameters analysed in the laboratory; 4- The authors feel that it would be over cumbersome since they are used to show per parameter; Figures 1-2 only show combined outlook of all the parameters which makes them to be combined as required; while Figures 3-8 show the pattern for other respective parameters analysed ; 5- Efforts have been made to rephrase the results and discussion section; 6- The units of moisture and bulk density have been incorporated into the tables; 7- The P-Value used has been shown; 8- 9 - 10- :The t-test value was used to make the decision reached; 11- The conclusion and recommendation section have been re-written as directed.
Minor REVISION comments	1- line99: write "from" instead of "in", put "the" before "control samples", change "observed not to be" with " which have not" 2- line102: write "were" before "taken", analysis is correct not analyses! 3- Line 103: "," should be used before "respectively" 4- Line 105: delete "until required. 5- Lines 105-108: the word" determined" is over used, use other synonyms instead. 6- Lines 108 to111 and 124 and 127: check plurality or singularity of the words and use proper verbs by means of singularity or plurality. 7- Line 125 and 127:wirte "that was " before "not mixed with oil" 8- Each table should entirely be in one page and not separately in two pages.	1- Done as directed 2- Done as directed 3- Done as directed 4- Done as directed 5- Other similar words have been used 6- The plurality and singularity have been considered 7- Done as directed 8- Done as directed.
Optional/General comments		