



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_43638
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of Environmental Conditions for remediation of contaminated water with oil using Placket-Burman Model
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 manuscript refers to a very interesting topic of global environmental importance, using a fungus as a bioremediator in order to accelerate the removal and biodegradation of the oily contaminants of the environment. The statistical model proposed by the authors is presented and discussed very well. Only some modifications are necessary:	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>The authors should be correct the model 'name used in the title.</p> <p>The sentence between lines 7-12 is too long. I suggest ending the sentence of line 9 after "Aspergillus niger", and start a new sentence on line 10.</p> <p>Line 19, add a comma after the word "hand", and include the word "the" before the temperature. "hand, the temperature"</p> <p>Line 37; correct the word "wastewater".</p> <p>I suggest that the authors review the phrase between lines 44-46. What enzymes do the authors to refer?</p> <p>Line 67; the authors should describe the method used to identify the microorganism. What technique was used? This information is of fundamental importance in view of the isolation of a microorganism. Where was the microorganism collected? Authors need to make this information clearer.</p> <p>Line 74. I suggest changing the word "trail" to "assay".</p> <p>Line 92 - I suggest revising the phrase "the carbon phosphorus containing compounds".....</p> <p>Line 93 - I suggest replacing the word "trials" to "assays" in the manuscript</p> <p>I suggest bettering described items 2.6 and 2.7. These equations are results, and not methods. I suggest linking these equations to the results obtained and shown in the manuscript. Describe where these equations were used.</p> <p>Table 1. For some evaluated variables, there is a disproportional difference between the level -1, 0 and +1. Normally the variation for levels -1 and +1 are equal when compared to the center point. Why were evaluated values so close to (-1) and (0) for the temperature?</p> <p>Table 2 - Authors should describe what the (-) signs mean in the absence of numbers in some combinations.</p> <p>Figures 1 and 2, the names of the factors described should be corrected.</p> <p>Figure 2 - describe in the legend the meaning of the respective green and red colors of the Pareto plot.</p> <p>Figure 6 remove the word "shows" from the phrase.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Tania Maria Costa</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Federal University of Santa Catarina, Brazil</i>