



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_9989
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS TREATMENT OF SOIL ON SUCCINATE DEHYDOGENASE AND LACTATE DEHYDOGENASE ACTIVITIES IN COWPEA (Vigna unguiculata) AND MAIZE (Zea mays) SEEDLINGS
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:

(<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	1. Abstract should be expanded to include briefly the rational of study i.e. why petroleum contaminated soil is of importance 2. The Materials and Methods section should include statistical software used to analyse CRD (Completely Randomised Design) 3. Figure 4.4.1 is a repetition of Figure 1. Remove the figure 4. Figure2. The treatment for 2% of all the petroleum products showed increased peaks at day8. This was not explained and discussed in the manuscript. 5. The graphs used the term "significant" but no statistical data was presented and determined.	The abstract has been expanded The computer software has been included Figure 4.4.1 has been deleted Figure 2 has been explained. The statistics has been presented
Minor REVISION comments	1. Line35 Page2. The sentence "Beside, heavier use of machinaery..." should be excluded because the proceeding sentence discussed on the transport, distribution and storage that contributed to pollution and not diesel use. 2. Line45 Page2. "When any organism...." Grammatical errors. Should be re-written. 3. Line51 Page3. The sentence "so the succinate denydrogenase" should be replace with "therefore this" 4. Line53 Page3. Delete "operation of the" and add "activity" after "(TCA)" instead. 5. Line67 Page3. Write in full "IITA"	All these minor corrections have been addressed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	6. Line75 Page4. Define “the petroleum products” 7. Line75 Page4. Define control by adding the sentence “(not treated with petroleum products)” 8. Line79 Page4. Is the engine oil is of new product or used engine oil? 9. Line83 Page4. Combine and Re-write the sentences from “Seed viability.....potentially viable” 10. Line 86-87 Page4. Delete the words “..as at when needed..” 11. Line98 Page5. pH7 should be in parenthesis. CHECK THROUGHOUT MANUSCRIPT 12. Line99 Page5. 1000g replace with 1000xg. CHECK THROUGHOUT MANUSCRIPT 13. Line112 Page5. Put in the concentrations such as potassium cyanide and succinate. CHECK THGOUGHOUT MANUSCRIPT. 14. Line114 Page5. Spelling error for spectrophotometer 15. Line146 Page7. Delete the words “form a part” 16. Line150 Page7. Spelling “portend” 17. Line153 Page7. Use a different word for “consonance”	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Format should be standardise and checked throughout the manuscript e.g. use of italics for <i>et al</i> 2. Other minor corrections are included in the scanned manuscript	The manuscript has been formatted