

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_116960
Title of the Manuscript:	Spent Lubricating Oil Decreased Vegetative Growth Parameters and Rhizosphere Microbial Abundance of Groundnuts (<i>Arachis hypogea</i>) and Maize (<i>Zea mays</i>)
Type of the Article	

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Importance for the Scientific Community: The manuscript is important for the scientific community, particularly those involved in environmental science, agriculture, and toxicology. It addresses significant environmental concerns related to the disposal of spent engine oil and its detrimental effects on agricultural land. The study's findings contribute to understanding the phytotoxic effects of such pollutants and underscore the need for stricter regulations and remediation efforts. These insights are crucial for developing strategies to mitigate pollution and promote sustainable agricultural practices. Suitability of the Title: The title of the article, "Spent Lubricating Oil Decreased Vegetative Growth Parameters and Rhizosphere Microbial Abundance of Groundnuts (Arachis hypogea) and Maize (Zea mays)", is quite suitable as it accurately reflects the study's focus and findings. However, to make it more concise and impactful, "Impact of Spent Lubricating Oil on Vegetative Growth and Rhizosphere Microbial Populations in Groundnuts and Maize". Comprehensiveness of the Abstract: The abstract provides a clear overview of the study's aims, methodology, results, and conclusions. It succinctly summarizes the experimental design, key findings regarding the impact of spent engine oil on plant growth and microbial counts, and emphasizes the environmental implications. This makes the abstract comprehensive and informative, giving readers a good preview of the study's content. Appropriateness of Subsections and Structure: The manuscript's structure is appropriate, with well-defined sections that logically present the introduction, methods, results, discussion, and conclusions. Each section is focused and contributes to the overall coherence of the paper. The use of subsections within the methods and results sections helps in detailing the experimental procedures and presenting the data clearly, which aids in the manuscript's readability and understandability. Scientific Correctness: The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the description provided. Sufficiency and Recency of References: The references seem sufficient and relevant, supporting the manuscript's context and discussions. The citations include both foundational studies and recent research, which indicates a good balance and depth in literature review. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Based on the information provided from the manuscript, the English language and quality of writing appear to be suitable for scholarly communication. The text is structured with clear and concise language, which is critical for effectively conveying research findings to the scientific community. The use of technical terms is appropriate, and the sentences are well-formed, aiding in the clarity and readability of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please the author improve the format and picture</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Sample size and repeatability : Although the study used three replicates, the paper did not specify whether the sample size was sufficient to ensure the statistical significance of the data. In environmental science, it is very important to ensure sufficient sample size to avoid data errors caused by insufficient sample size. Data representation and chart clarity : As mentioned in your description, the representation of some experimental data may require clearer chart support. A clear display of charts and data is essential for the readability and understanding of scientific papers, especially when presenting complex scientific data. Consideration of ethical issues : Although there are no obvious ethical issues with the study, the paper should include more detailed ethical statements, especially on how to safely handle and dispose of hazardous substances used in experiments. <p>This rating implies that while the manuscript is of high quality and relevance, addressing significant environmental issues with a robust experimental setup and clear reporting, there might be room for improvement in certain areas. These could include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Enhancing the clarity and presentation of some data and figures for better understanding. Potentially updating or expanding the literature review to include the latest findings or more comprehensive discussions on remediation techniques. Ensuring all ethical considerations, particularly concerning the handling and disposal of toxic substances, are 	

Review Form 1.7

	clearly stated. 4.Minor adjustments in language to ensure consistency and readability throughout the manuscript. Such revisions would ensure the manuscript meets the highest standards expected for scholarly communication and could potentially elevate it to a "Accept As It Is" status upon re-evaluation.	
--	---	--

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:	Ran Hao
Department, University & Country	Xi'an University of Architecture and Technology, China