

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_101282
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Total Hydrocarbon Contents in the Leaves of Selected Crops Grown on Crude Oil Polluted Agricultural Soil
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.journalbjournal.com/index.php/BJI/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>English is ok.</p> <p>It is a work that focuses on the determination of THC in a series of plants treated with hydrocarbons. The data is good; however, it is advisable to attend to the following observations:</p> <p>It would be interesting to add other examples from the literature regarding the presence of this type of contaminants in plants, likewise to expand a little, the part of the information regarding the contamination of these compounds.</p> <p>THC definition repeated throughout the document, please; They should only define it once TOTAL HYDROCARBON CONTENT (THC), then use THC or Total Hydrocarbon content. You also have to review other definitions or acronyms, such as: UPS and PS.....</p> <p>Regarding the method, it calls my attention when they refer to "atomic absorption spectrophotometric", from my point of view using the term "atomic" indicates that only elements can be determined, for example; heavy metals. Apparently, they are using UV-vis absorption spectrometry....</p> <p>In section 3.1.1 the values .. (381.00) are shown when compared to the other polluted samples (PS = 883.14, TOPA = 789.51, ACPB = 695.90, ACPA = 670.29, ZMPB = 820.66, ZMPA = 845.30) the units are missing ...</p> <p>Figures 2-4 are far from the text that describes them</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Miguel Velazquez-Manzanas
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autonoma de Coahuila, Mexico