



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJPSS_11742
Title of the Manuscript:	BIOREMEDIATION OF THREE BRAZILIAN SOILS CONTAMINATED WITH USED LUBRICATING OIL
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 <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>I suggest rewriting Abstract and dividing it into subsection as it is described in the Authors guidelines.</p> <p>Wrong citations as well in the manuscript text as in the References section. Authors should carefully read Authors instructions!</p> <p>References must be numbered in the order that they appear in the text (not alphabetically as Authors used). Moreover in the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets – please rewrite it in the Introduction.</p> <p>Nothing is known about soil sampling – how the soils were sampled? Which soil layer was investigated? Surface? Subsurface? Is there any soil replications?</p> <p>In relation to organic carbon content Authors cited work from 1934 – is it really lack of newest methodology?</p> <p>Please also add information about pH equipment you used.</p> <p>There are two similar citations US EPA 2007 – Authors should distinguish them.</p> <p>Fig. 3 and Fig 4 should be downsized – it is not necessary to put them on one printed page.</p>	<p>We agreed with comments. The abstract has been re-written according to the author's guidelines, and are shown in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>The wrong citations have been corrected in the revised manuscript. References are numbered in the order that they appeared in the revised manuscript as instructed by the reviewer. Introduction has been re-written and more text are added.</p> <p>Soil sampling in details now included in section 2.1 of the material and methods of the revised manuscript.</p> <p>Organic methodology has been updated and now included in the revised manuscript. Information about pH also included. The US EPA 2007 has been differentiated; they were published same year but different methodologies.</p> <p>Fig. 3 and 4 now re-drawn and merged in the same page as fig. 1, corrected as instructed, and now included in the revised manuscript.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 56 – check the citation Das and Chendryan- it should be 2010 or 2011 as is written in the References?	It was 2011, and has been corrected in the revised manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The subject of the manuscript is interesting and proper for publishing in IJPSS. However, Authors should adapt to editorial requirements of IJPSS and prepare manuscript according IJPSS rules. Section Material and Methods needs supplementation and References must be necessary rewritten.	Material and Methods have been supplemented and references re-written as suggested by the reviewer.