



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	2014_ARRB_11131
Title of the Manuscript:	BIOREMEDIATION OF INDUSTRIAL EFFLUENT USING CYANOBACTERIAL SPECIES: <i>PHORMIDIUM MUCICOLA</i> AND <i>ANABAENA AEQUALIS</i>
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The author should re-write the abstract and introduction sections better. Because I tried my best to understand what the author is trying to convey but I could not digest it well.	Correct manuscript
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Is the research outdated or up-to-date? Because the latest journal the author cited was 2007. Please the author should include recent findings in order to compare and judge his findings with current and up-to-date data.	Changes some references
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The text contents a lot of spelling and grammatical mistakes.	Correct the spelling and grammatical mistakes