SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	**2013_BJAST_3790**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Identification of the Constituents of Crude Oil from Adaril Oil Well Using Laser Induced Breakdown Spectroscopy**

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:
(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	Page 4 – Line 134: first sentence "Emission lines of samples have minimal interference…" needs a deeper and detailed explanation. In which way they state this sentence. Page 4 and Page 5: Figures 2, 3 and 4 are too small and peaks are too narrow to be distinguished. Further, the authors assume that is possible to see the atomic lines of atoms and ions detected but it's not possible to distinguish which peak correspond to the element examined. I suggest, if they want to show the entire emission spectra of each sample, to do for each spectra inserts about the main peaks considered for the elements analysed. Page 4 – Line137: About Table 1 here is not clear which database they used to find the reference peaks and if the wavelengths reported are referred to the ones read on the spectrograph (which I suppose) or if they are the ones of the database chosen (e.g., NIST, Kurucz, etc). Need to be clarified. Page 6 – From Line 166 to Line 170: this point is fundamental otherwise all measurements about O, H and N fail. It's important to better explain the methodology applied to avoid interference from the air. Unless the authors do measurements in	DONE

	vacuum. Page 7: Figures 5 and 6 at the moment are totally incomprehensible, need to be bigger and readable. So, no discussion can be done on these figures.	
Minor REVISION comments	Page 4 – From Line 131 to Line 133: these details better fit into the 2.3 Experimental Procedure subparagraph. Check References to add some more recent paper for example: F. J. Fortes, T. Ctvrtnı´ckova´, M. P. Mateo, L. M. Cabalı´n, G. Nicolas, and J. J. Laserna, Spectrochemical study for the in situ detection of oil spill residues using LIBS, Anal. Chim. Acta 683, 52 (2010).	**DONE**
Optional/General comments	The paper by Almuslet and Saifeldin handles a useful subject, since the LIBS is a potentially technique that can be used for rapid screening in many fields (e.g., crude oils) and it is always a welcome contribution to the literature. The paper is interesting but presents significant issues that the authors have to solve before the paper merits publication. Some points and figures need to be clear for better comprehension of the paper.	**DONE**