

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_127726
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Natural Attenuation on the Nutrient Stability of Simulated Oil Spill contaminated Soils
Type of the Article	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>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The research article is not novel, however, it will serve as a monitoring guide for remediation effort.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The referencing format need to be consistent. I would advice you look up the standard format for referencing in APA 7 th edition format and stick to it. The use of "&" is missing and some of the authors initials in the references are not consistent.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Abstract <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of clarity on the study's statistical rigor and key quantitative findings. Include the statistical approach used (if any), such as percentage reductions or confidence intervals, and highlight specific reductions in THC/TPH to emphasize results. Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overly descriptive and redundant definitions of natural attenuation; limited articulation of the research gap. Shorten the explanation of general concepts and focus on identifying the specific problem this study addresses (e.g., natural attenuation's unassessed effectiveness in the Niger Delta). Materials and Methods	

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No statistical analysis appear to have been conducted or reported. • Use ANOVA to compare THC/TPH levels across different contamination levels and locations. • Specify the number of replicates for each treatment and clarify control sample conditions. No control sample was reported, do you care to justify? <p>Results</p> <p>1. Statistical Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Observed trends lack statistical validation. o Add statistical significance (e.g., p-values or standard deviations) to confirm differences in THC/TPH reductions across treatments. <p>2. Data Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Tables and figures lack explanations for statistical or biological significance. o Include captions explaining observed trends (e.g., “Significant reduction in THC observed in Elele samples compared to Isiokpo, $p < 0.05$”). <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The discussion does not explore differences between Elele and Isiokpo soils in terms of microbial activity or other factors that may explain variability in THC/TPH reductions. • Discuss potential causes of observed trends, such as soil composition, moisture content, or microbial diversity differences. <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusion is overly generic and lacks actionable recommendations. • Suggest integrating natural attenuation with enhanced bioremediation strategies (e.g., biostimulation) for quicker remediation. <p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent formatting of citations (Look up the proper APA 7th edition referencing style and apply to your references. • Standardize references to align with journal guidelines, ensuring uniformity in journal names, volume numbers, and DOIs. 	
--	--	--

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:	Efe Jeffery Isukuru
Department, University & Country	Texas Tech University, Nigeria