



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_48010
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Physicochemical Qualities of Oilfield Wastewater in Bayelsa State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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	<p>= Line 90: Title of Table 1: "Physicochemical Parameters of Oilfield Wastewater from Kolo creek flow station and EPU 05".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indicate values are means of what replicate under the table. - Key for the table: NTU ?, TDS ?, TSS ?, THC ?, BOD ?, COD ?, DPR ?, FMEEnv ? and NS ?. <p>= Line 102: Title of Table of 2: " Heavy Metals Content of Oilfield Wastewater from Kolo creek flow station and EPU 05".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Check the values in the table and description of results and reconcile e.g. Arsenic 0.07 and 0.007. - Key for the table: DPR ? and FMEEnv ? <p>= Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussed the pH and temperature results between the two sampling locations and give possible reasons why so and compare with previous reports. - Also discussed on the heavy metals result and give possible reasons why so and compare with previous reports from other works. <p>= Conclusion: You conclude based on your findings as captured in Tables 1 and 2, before talking about improvement in the treatment.</p> <p>= Reference: FMEEnv was not listed in the reference section.</p>	I have done corrections as advised



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Line 8: 'impact' instead of impacted - Line 18: 'were' instead of was - Line 21: Unit of arsenic concentration - Line 25: Abstract did not talk about "bacteriological diversity" why in keywords - Line 39: 'environment' instead of environmental - Line 46: Provide reference - Line 77: 'Parameters' instead of constituents - Line 99: Give the name of the heavy metals 	
Optional/General comments	The paper should have included the results of bacteriological quality if any to make it richer.	

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>NO</p>	I have made the necessary corrections as advised