

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_131298
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Soybean Waste and Pigeon Dropping on the Total Hydrocarbon Content of Crude-Oil Polluted Soil
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This paper reports the important clue for using waste streams and natural resource for Bio-remediation mechanism. The genuine of these are analysis in environmental parameter, some parameter is strong differences, The dynamics of the microbial population reveals the heterotrophic or directly utilizing bacteria population has the most related trend.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title states there are strong impact influence on THC bioremediation based on model experiments. However, they show similar, or close patterns between different consortiums in SBD and pigeon dipping. These phenomena were popular sensed natural reactions. Rather a mechanistic approach. Important remedial activity by simulative bacteria consortium by amended Soybean Waste and Pigeon Droppings on Total Hydrocarbon, Crude Oil-Contaminated Soil.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	I don't know if there is a limitation on word number, but it's over 350 words, the introduction in the forehead could be cut, with shorted 2-3 sentences for the introduction. It should be cut down to 250 words.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The data always has the power to convince the possible, there is randomness, eg. In Fungi, we might state that there is strong affinity, adsorb to the soil particles, and suggest to be consultable.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The very importance of methods for microbial handling in Prescott <i>et al.</i> , 2011, parameter analysis, APHA, seems missing, I believe there are others. They should be carefully revised. Important references are listed in 2012-2019, eg. Manli, W., et al., Ughala, E ., these refs did not cite. Maybe others.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the writing has strong indications for some discussion points. The structure of the article is good, however, the need to refocus us in a new direction is needed. What different results between Manli and me at some point, and my result is more persuasive in bacteria consortium.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hsiao Dao Chang
Department, University & Country	Ming Chi University of Technology, Taiwan