



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_47089
Title of the Manuscript:	Microbial remediation of Used Engine Oil from Contaminated Soil around Automobile Workshop in Calabar Metropolis, Cross River State, Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	Abstract: Authors should review the tenses used. Use past tense where necessary. Also, mentioning that the method is/was cost effective which is outside the scope of your study does not augur well. Check and correct the number of your subheadings. It is proper to write "mL" instead of "ml". Always give a space before addition units to actual values. Report in past tense when outlining the methods employed. In your discussion, there was too much repetition of some words such as "statistically". Your discussion should be presented in a more scientific manner and therefore must be revisit. Authors are advised to revisit and look at the overall grammatical errors in the manuscript. You may download "grammarly" application for assistance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the corrections in the abstract has been effected The subheadings were numbered following the Science Domain International template for paper submission. The correction from ml to mL has been effected. The correction for reporting in past tense in the method has been effected. The correction in the discussion has been corrected and all presentation scientifically arranged. All grammatical errors in the manuscript has been checked and corrections effected. PLEASE CHECKED THE CORRECTED MANUSCRIPT FOR YOUR VERIFICATION.
Minor REVISION comments	Description of study area: Needs revisiting and reconstruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correction in the description of study area has been effected.
Optional/General comments		

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>	No ethical issues existed in this manuscript.