

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_123068
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of Bioremediation of Crude-oil Polluted Soil through Variation in Moisture Content and Proportion of Augmenting Bacterium and Fungus
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I appreciate this manuscript because it emphasises the importance of optimizing bioremediation processes so as to enhance the hydrocarbon biodegradation process to clean up crude-oil polluted environments within the shortest possible time due to the threat posed to habitats exposed to the pollution. The only part I'm sceptical about is the inability of the author to declare any certainty in the identification of the microorganisms used	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	This title is appropriate.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is very comprehensive indeed. In addition, the TCH acronym which I presume to mean 'Total hydrocarbon Content' needs to be defined. Moreover, I believe that <i>klebsiella ornithinolytica</i> has been misspelled in the abstract. Less importantly, I am not sure of the omission of the name of your institution in the abstract is intentional or an oversight.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In section 2.4, the Hub on your first sentence should be in Capital letters. In section 4. 'Discussion' should be capitalized. Also, you need to recast your opening sentence in this subsection for clarity. Vis, "isolated" should be revised to "isolates"	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust, as we see that three different factors were considered in the augmentation procedure. The choice of organisms was also arrived at based on the screening for their hydrocarbon utilization potential. It is technically sound because most of the procedures used are standardized procedures.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient. However, only about 65% of them are recent.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. The English quality of the article is indeed suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	In Figure 3. The scale in the bar chart should be revised to give a better visual of your data.	

#### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Otote Tobi Obehi
Department, University & Country	University of Ibadan, Nigeria