



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Biochemistry Research &amp; Review</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_44205
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytoremediation of Crude Oil Polluted Agricultural Soil Using Schwenkia americana and Spermacoce ocymoides
Type of the Article	Original research papers

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The expt lacked design, the author(s) should state the number of treatments, replications and how the expt was layed out.</p> <p>What is the role of <i>lactura sativa</i> in this expt. ?</p> <p>it is expected that the author(s) should have determined the carbon:nitrogen ratio to confirm claims that microbes actually utilized the crude oil. Otherwise such claim is spurious.</p> <p>Reasons adduced for increase of PAH in unpolluted pots cannot be verified since this is potted experiment containing highly impervious material that cannot allow transport of materials to another.</p> <p>All the Tables should be restructured .e.g columns with S. americana should read grown pot instead of remediated. Also before column should read 0 weeks after planting (WAP), 12 WAP).</p> <p>How come the polluted control and unpolluted control were used for germination test?. Why are they referred to as control.?</p>	<p>The experimental design has been recast while stating the number of treatments, replications and lay out.</p> <p><i>Lactura sativa</i> L. was employed for post remediation of the treated soil due to its sensitivity to hydrocarbon polluted soil. It was expected to give an idea of hydrocarbon reduction level by either thriving or retarding in growth. It can also give an idea of how the treated soils are able to support growth of plants subsequently.</p> <p>The carbon:nitrogen ratio has been included.</p> <p>Yes, it is potted experiment. For successful growth of the plants, aeration has to be allowed for passage into the potted soils and this was done by perforating the sides of the buckets up to the levels close to the ground. Of course there was rainfall and erosion where the experimental pots were laid out. Hydrocarbon materials may have been sorbed onto the unpolluted soils, thus giving rise to the slight increase. This is a suggestion as there may be other reasons for such an increment.</p> <p>Tables have been restructured. Rather than 0 WAP, BP was used because the baseline analyses were carried out before the soils were potted and not after planting.</p> <p>The germination percentage of both the controls and treatments were determined to give idea of the changes that may have occurred on the treatments and compare them with those of the polluted and unpolluted controls.</p> <p>Germination (%) was given by:</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<p>(Number of seeds that germinated / Number of seeds propagated) × 100</p> <p>For germination index, control cannot be used to calculate the germination index. This was simply an oversight.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Lines 70-73 are so confusing , please recast. There are also many other grammar errors that need attention. Authors should in between lines to correct them.</p>	<p>This has been taken care of.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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