

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_119246
Title of the Manuscript:	Bio-Degradation of Spent Oil in Contaminated Soil Using Citrullus Colocynthis Peeling and Other Plant Wastes
Type of the Article	Research

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)
Review	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title is not convincing. 2. Rewrite abstract. An abstract should clearly mention the research gap, methodology, result and conclusion. 3. Soils are contaminated with what or its spent oil-contaminated soil?? Please clarify. 4. Expand abbreviations in the abstract and body. 5. Please check the p-value. 6. Introduction is not written properly. Rewrite it. Objectives and hypotheses are not given without which the introduction is incomplete. The introduction lacks clarity. It looks like general statements regarding the topic so better to rewrite. 7. Species should start with a small letter. Kindly check this throughout the manuscript. 8. Use punctuation marks at suitable places 9. In some sentences, full stops are missing. Check it 10. No initial properties of collected soil is given in methodology. 11. Check grammatical errors throughout the manuscript 12. Extraction portion in methodology can be explained more. 13. Results and discussions are not properly written. The result should be specific. 14. No CD or LSD values are given in any table or figure expressing data. 15. Quality of the figures is not up to the mark. Applied for all the figures. Figure quality is poor. Keep better quality pictures. Use uniform table and figure captions. 16. Rewrite the conclusion in a better way. 17. Kindly check the reference style. I have a doubt on reference style. 18. Casually written paper that lacks objective. The whole manuscript needs thorough revision. It should be rewritten. Very silly mistakes are there. Discussion is poorly written. 	
<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>May be</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>Science is there but not explained properly</p> <p>Yes</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>Language needs modification</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	Complete modification is required	
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

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:	Amit Kumar Dash
Department, University & Country	ICAR-Indian Institute of Seed Science, India