



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_48631
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of compounds in spent oil contaminated soil
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 (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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Title: Author(s) may want to consider amending the title to reflect the fact that organic contaminants were the focus of the study.</p> <p>Abstract: There seems to be a mix-up in the location of the sampling sites stated in the abstract (“...two mechanical workshops located in Gwagwalada Area Council..”) and the sampling locations mentioned under the Materials and methods (“...two auto mechanic workshops soils located in Ilorin and tipper garage in Gwagwalada Area Council,,,”). The SDP mechanical workshop and Dagiri mechanical workshop referred to in lines 6-7 of the abstract and in discussing the results, were not mentioned as the sampling sites under the Materials and methods. These should be corrected.</p> <p>Introduction: In line 21-23 on page 2, PAHs was mentioned as the most important environmental carcinogenic factors. Author(s) are to state whether the PAHs are present as additives or contaminants that result from operation of the engine; and also write PAH in full at its first mention, with PAH in bracket.</p> <p>Materials and methods: Authors are to address the relevant comments about sampling locations mentioned above under Abstract; and ensure correct grammatical expressions.</p> <p>Results and discussion: Please read through and correct all mistakes e.g Page 3 line 1 under results should read “The chromatogram of the extracts from SMW, DMW and SCO...”; Page 4 line 9 DMW to be corrected to read SMW; Page 6 line 11-12, 17, Table 1 shows compounds identified in SMW extract and not DMW. Same for Page 8 line 7-8, the range C₁₅- C₃₅ is for SMW. Authors are to note for correction: there are two figures with labelled as Fig. 4 (page 8 and page 22); Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 were duplicated; not all the compounds in Fig. 8 are PAHs (page 12 lines 1-2); provide answer to the question- “what is the implication of these?” on page 8 line 9, and correct the spelling of Ogunbaya et al.</p> <p>Conclusion: Line 3 under the conclusion, range C₁₅- C₃₅ is for SMW and not DMW.</p> <p>References: The references are okay.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Author(s) are to read through the manuscript and correct all mistakes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jokotade Owoso
Department, University & Country	Yaba College of Technology, Nigeria