

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Soil Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_90026
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF ABATTOIR ACTIVITIES ON THE PHYSICO-CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL PROPERTIES OF SOIL SAMPLES FROM CHOBA SLAUGHTER, RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA
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:

(<https://www.journalasrj.com/index.php/ASRJ/editorial-policy> )

### 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The information concerning the slaughterhouse is not very clear, such as the slaughter period, types of animals slaughtered, the manner of slaughter, the daily and annual slaughter average....</li> <li>- The methods of analysis of the physico-chemical parameters of the soil must be further developed. Concerning the soil temperature, the sampling method cannot be adequate.</li> <li>- The microbiological analysis methods as well as the technique of characterization and identification of isolates are not referenced.</li> <li>- The number of repetitions and at what level (block or sample) should be quoted.</li> <li>- The results in table 3 concerning the characterization and identification of bacterial isolates have not been mentioned.</li> <li>- The strong point concerning the elevation of nitrate levels in the region where the animal hides are roasted (the essential contaminant of groundwater) was not discussed and not mentioned in the conclusion.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The microbiological analysis methods as well as the technique of characterization and identification of isolates are excessively detailed and can be summarized.</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The conclusion can be better developed by addressing the results.</li> <li>- Despite the importance of the subject and the results obtained, the work is ambiguous and badly approached, especially concerning the physico-chemical parameters of the soil.</li> </ul> <p>However, the objective can be better targeted and the results can in particular be better exploited by adding other recent bibliographical references and in direct relation with the subject.</p>	

### PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ghanem Kourteli Nadra
Department, University & Country	Batna 2 Mostapha Benboulaid University, Algeria