

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JABB_80492 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | EFFICACY OF AMENDMENTS IN TPH REMOVAL DURING BIOREMEDIATION OF AGRICULTURAL CRUDE OIL-POLLUTED SOIL |
| Type of the 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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | Your abstract is poor. Please summarize your method clearly so that it could be understood. As I read your manuscript, there is no data on parameter monitoring during the experiment. Is your experiment done under the lab scale or real field situation. How about your moisture content, temperature, and pH of the treatment? As this study is mainly focused on TPH removal using different stimulant, please include data on TPH removal on the treatment using different bio stimulant. Other than that, please clarify the significant of your findings to be highlighted in this study. | |
| Minor REVISION comments | Please refers to the highlighted comments in the manuscript. | |
| Optional/General comments | Overall, this is a clear manuscript. The introduction is relevant, and theory based. However, there is insufficient information about the previous study findings is presented for readers to follow the present study rationale and procedures. The methods are generally appropriate, although clarification of a few details needed (reference & citation) and provision of a rationale for the use of this methods should be provided. Overall, the results are clear but need to add more discussion to support your findings. Overall, this manuscript must be revised carefully before been published as high quality paper of implications for the theoretical basis. | |

Review Form 1.6

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: | <i>Nur Zaida Zahari</i> |
| Department, University & Country | <i>Universiti Malaysia Sabah (UMS), Malaysia</i> |