



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_46678
Title of the Manuscript:	Multiple Degradation and Resistance Capabilities of Marine Bacteria Isolated from Niger Delta, Nigeria on Petroleum Pollutants and Heavy Metals
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>)



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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LINE 22 – (METHOD) grammatically, 'between' should be followed by 'and'. i.e. Between... AND... OR From... TO... 2. LINE 29 – correct the spelling of "forty" <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Paragraphs 1 and 2 are too short to stand as paragraphs. It might be best to merge them. 4. LINE 47 – The world ... 5. LINE 58 - The impact of these wastes in the Niger Delta ecosystems of Nigeria is an obvious environmental concern particularly with regards to the persistence and ecotoxicity of these wastes. 6. LINE 67 - A better way is to use enhanced biodegradation 7. LINE 103 – Port Harcourt 8. LINE 110 – and accounts for... 9. LINE 147 - Enrichment, Culturing and Isolation of Aromatic Hydrocarbon Degrading Bacterial Strains 10. LINE 152 – autoclaving at 121 °C and 15 psi² for ... 11. LINE 154 – Uniformly spread... 12. LINE 155 - and 0.1 mL aliquots of the 10⁻³ dilutions were spread plated on the surfaces of the solidified media with the aid of a glass spreader. 13. LINE 165 – check spelling of 'Bijou' 14. LINES 182 – 183: how does the Gram's Test determine purity of a bacterium? 15. LINE 250 – correct spelling of 'forty' 16. LINE 252 – CORRECT SPELLING OF 'SEPARATELY' 17. Sample collection – how many sets of samples were collected per point? Was sampling done just once? 18. In determining the effect of the test hydrocarbons on the growth of the isolates, how was the growth/ turbidity monitored? At what interval was the turbidity measured and over what time period? Was turbidity measured only once for each set up? This should be clearly stated. 19. In observing growth on the various hydrocarbon compounds, was turbidity measured at regular intervals or just once? If just once, what was the timeframe? 20. LINE 270 – ppp or ppm? 21. LINE 421 – John and Okpokwasili, [19] report that nitrifying bacteria is-are an 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>excellent degraders and has ability to utilize crude oil and its products. [Degradation implies utilization in this case so the second part of that sentence is redundant].</p> <p>RESULTS & DISCUSSION</p> <p>22. There are no results for the statistical analysis.</p> <p>23. The first paragraph of the discussion is not relevant to the discussion (it could be removed or transferred to the introduction). <u>Do not reiterate methodology or results in your discussion.</u></p> <p>24. Lines 367 – 374 are not relevant to the discussion of your results.</p> <p>25. Following identification, the results should clearly outline species relative to sampling location (Nembe, Abonema or Onne). Place of isolation can be inserted in Table 4.</p> <p>26. Which of the organisms were multiple degraders? Which of the test hydrocarbons were they able to degrade effectively? Degradation efficiency of the isolates on the different hydrocarbons was not stated or discussed. Were any of the identified isolates able to degrade all three hydrocarbons tested? Was the quantity of the test hydrocarbon remaining at the end of the degradation study period determined?</p> <p>27. The discussion should include an assessment of which of the test hydrocarbons (Anthracene, xylene or Pyrene) were more easily degraded</p> <p>28. Tables 5 & 6 – replace the isolate codes with the names of the identified species so the meaning of the result is immediately clear. This makes it easier for the reader to understand the information shown in the figures such as which grew best at the different concentrations.</p> <p>29. Plate 4, Figures 2 – 4: Figures must always be self-explanatory. In order for the figures to be self-explanatory, the isolate codes used should be explained under the figure caption as sub-text. E.g. ANT1 - <i>Providencia vermicola</i> OR replace these codes with the actually names of the species.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Methodology is clearly defined.</p> <p>A good introduction to the study. The significance of the study is clear.</p> <p>It is preferable that identification of the isolates be reported first. This makes it easier for the reader to understand the information shown in subsequent figures</p> <p>Discussion in not robust enough.</p>	

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



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Anwuli U. Osadebe</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Port Harcourt , Nigeria</i>