



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_ARRB_11131
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>BIOREMEDIATION OF INDUSTRIAL EFFLUENT USING CYANOBACTERIAL SPECIES: <i>PHORMIDIUM MUCICOLA</i> AND <i>ANABAENA AEQUALIS</i></b>
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>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.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Is the research outdated or up-to-date?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.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The text contents a lot of spelling and grammatical mistakes.	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Mustapha Mujeli</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Modibbo Adama University of Technology Yola, Nigeria</i></b>