



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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. Introduction section does not contain updated reference cover the title of the papered it should include updated work (e.g Safi J., Awad Y., El-Nahhal Y. (2014) Bioremediation of Diuron in Soil and by Cyanobacterial Mat. American Journal of Plant Sciences, 2014, Vol. 5, No 8, 1081-1089.)</p> <p>2. The objectives of this work should be clearly stated at the end of this section</p> <p>Materials and method section Soil samples should be identified by latitude and altitudes coordinates and should be described interns of meteorological, geological and agricultural characteristics.</p> <p>The physical properties of used engine oil should be reported.</p>	<p>1. The updated reference given has been included and;</p> <p>2. The objectives of the work are clearly stated in the introduction.</p> <p>Soil samples are identified by latitude, longitudes and altitude; meteorological and agricultural characteristics now included in the revised manuscript. The physical properties of the used lubricating oil is not necessarily important to be reported in the manuscript, because we were interested in the overall hydrocarbon</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Add more details to: Cleveland Biotech Ltd, UK.</p> <p>Authors used sodium azide to kill the microbes in soil. Usually, this method is not common in soil, it is ok in liquid, it is recommended to use Autoclave to kill microbes in soil. Accordingly authors should support their work by reference.</p> <p>Line 97 it is not clear the sampling dates.</p> <p>It seems that the authors do not have control negative (sterile soil+oil-Bacteria) .</p> <p>Section 2.4 should include references although the methods are true</p>	<p>contents which have been fully reported in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>Details about Cleveland Biotech Ltd, UK; were reported under section 2.2 of the revised manuscript.</p> <p>Noted for subsequence research work, though, most authors used sodium azide in the publications to kill the microbes in soil.</p> <p>The sampling was done in 2011, and included in the revised manuscripts.</p> <p>Control negative is reported in the section 2.2 of the material and methods of the revised manuscript.</p> <p>The methods for the physicochemical properties are now included in the revised manuscript with the appropriate references.</p>
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Section 2.4 contains Table 2 but this should be Table 1. However, the Table should be moved to Results and discussion section. Moreover, ECEC line 123 should be corrected to CEC (cation exchange capacity)</p> <p>Section 2.5, line 139, CFU should be in full. Moreover, what was the initial concentration of added cells? Counting cell is not fully described in this section.</p> <p>Section 2.6 does not contain plank oil recovery</p> <p>Section 3.1. It is better to arrange the data in Table instead of text. Moreover, Fig 3 should be renamed to fig 1 and consequently other figs. It is recommended to change color to be able to distinguish the differences among treatment. Moreover, error bar should be presented in +/- so that it appears up and down in each column. The same comment for figure 4.</p>	<p>The table is re-written as table 1. The table is left in section because it was discussed under physicochemical properties of the soil.</p> <p>It was fully sated, and initial concentration of the added cells included in the section 2.2 of the revised manuscript.</p> <p>Included in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>Section 3.1. The data is best presented in figure, cleared and well explanatory in the manuscript. It does not necessarily to be arranged in tables. Moreover, fig. 3 and 4 have been re-named as figure 1 and subsequently, and the graphs re-drawn with colours, and the error bar presented in +/- as suggested and included in</p>
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Fig 5, the regression equation should be summarized and presented in table so that it would be better to understand it. It is recommended to refer to soils as S1, S2, and S3 as mentioned in the methodology, moreover, in the discussion and refer to the clay content to explain the results and include supporting references</p> <p>Table 4, T1-T4, should be fully described in the methodology section. More elaboration in statistical analysis in the text is required</p> <p>Reference section should include updated reference year 2013-2014.</p> <p>All cited reference should be written in the same style. Moreover, lines 434-436, Stotzky and Norman (1961,a,b) each needs paper title</p>	<p>the revised manuscript.</p> <p>The soils represented by S1, S2, and S3 are included in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>T1-T4 is fully described in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>Updated references are included in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>Cited references re-written in the same style in the revised manuscript. Moreover, paper title of Stocky and Norman (1961, a,b) is included in the revised manuscript.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		