



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>There are significant issues with this manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The experimental location is not well documented – should have a description of locale with GPS coordinates, source of pollutants, distances between sampling sites etc.</li> <li>2. <b>Chemical oxygen demand (APHA 5220C)</b></li> <li>3. – something missing in the first line</li> <li>4. Did the Norkram medium really have 20,00gm per liter of sucrose? Seems past solubility point to me.</li> <li>5. were amended with 16.1, 8.1, 4.0 and 2.0mg/dl – with what?</li> <li>6. I am not clear what pre and post-remediation samples refer to? Bacterial. Fungal treatments? Both? Something else?</li> </ol> <p>Some problems still with language: result primarily from local irritation.? After injection ingestion?</p>	<p>Comments noted. Effected appropriately.</p> <p>Comments noted and effected appropriately</p> <p>It should be 20mg.</p> <p>With the usual reagent.</p> <p>The pre-remediation is the sample before treatment while post-remediation samples are samples after treatment. The treatment is done with Fungi</p> <p>None</p>