



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_47233
Title of the Manuscript:	Brief Review on the Genotoxic Effects and Environmental Implications of Oil-related Pollutants in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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>The manuscript reviews on the Genotoxic Effects and Environmental Implications of Oil-related Pollutants in Nigeria. Overall, it is a review on a very important theme from environmental biotechnology perspective. However, this manuscript is not acceptable in its current form. Serious Major revision are required to improve it further with careful emphasis to referencing which is not always right and up to date.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title: Environmental Implications already includes Genotoxic Effects, please make the title brief and clear. 2. Please revise some small grammar mistakes in the paper. 3. The whole abstract is just a simple descriptive. Avoid general description which is already well reported and documented. It does not give any brief account of the background to deduce the justification for this work. Normally an abstract should include the above along with stating briefly the purpose of the study undertaken and meaningful conclusions based on the obtained results. Hence, this needs rewriting. I would expect brief, yet concise, the quantitative description of the results in the abstract. 4. Introduction seems too tedious, since this article is aimed at reviewing the genotoxic effects and environmental implications of oil-related pollutants on some Nigerian plants and ecosystem. "Cytology" "Plant morphological examination" "Plant cuticular examination" "Plant anatomical examination" such methods introduction is not necessary to have a very detailed introduction. 5. I suggest author to propose some solutions or some author's own idea regarding the problems in this review paper. Generally speaking, the review should have author's point of view. 6. A review should not be a list of materials, but rather a review of materials that with comments and valuations. 7. What is the most noteworthy conclusion the authors made for this review rather than presenting other researchers' results? 8. Some of the references are out of date. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>9. The logical level of this paper is not clear, in the results part, the objects of “Growth inhibition and stimulation” c) “Epidermal modification”, “Chromosomal aberration” seems are plants. But the objects of “Altered chemical properties” and “Presence of heavy metals” seems are environment.</p> <p>10. Some headlines are mis-ordered, please revise.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer’s comment</p>	<p>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></p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dengxin Li
Department, University & Country	Donghua University, China