

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Microbiology Research Journal International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_MRJI_104669</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Enhanced Phytoremediation Crude Oil Polluted Soil Using Pseudomonas Fluorescens.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalmri.com/index.php/MRJI/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes it is important because of current Crude oil pollution is one of the major environmental problems effecting terrestrial and aquatic environments. Authors are approximately reaches towards their objective but in next level certainly this work will reach to next level.</p> <p>Yes the title of the article is appropriately suitable.</p> <p>Yes the abstract of the article is not appropriate comprehensive.</p> <p>No need to change.</p> <p>Yes the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>No, references are not sufficient and try to add some recent ones.</p> <p>Author should rewrite the conclusion section entirely. Author should add more discussion related to their work.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Author should change in the subheading first letter capital exclude the words such as of, the, and.....</p> <p>Correct/ check digits in the subsection <b>Phytoremediation</b> (API = 32.30; sulfur content: 0.08%).</p> <p>The last lines of page number 3, no need to write in word as well as in digit- Two thousand five hundred grams (2500g) of the contaminated soil were weighed into 8 batches while 2500g of the uncontaminated soil were weighed into 2 batches. Also check the grammatical errors in the introduction section.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Darshana B. Bhaisare
Department, University & Country	Nagpur Veterinary College, India