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:** *PHORMIDIUM MUCICOLA* **AND** *ANABAENA AEQUALIS*
Type of the Article	**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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	Introduction section: Authors ignored the recent published work with cyanobacteria and bioremediation (e.g. El-Nahhal et al, 2013, and Safi et al, 2014) and should make connection with the up dated published work. Lines 57-59, objectives do not need reference, delete Materials and methods Lines 101-102 need reference . Line 109. It is not clear how authors made bacteria free by ultraviolet irradiation (2537Å). Line 114. How many cells were in 100 µl of cyanobacterial or what was the optical density of the final solution. Lines 120-139. It is not clear how the bioassay determine the effect, or how the remediation was calculated. Authors can use the equation developed by El-Nahhal et al, 2013, and Safi et al, 2014 to determine the effect. Authors did not use statistical analysis of the results so that it is hardly to judge the results. It is recommended to use statistical analysis for the results before the paper can be published. Results and discussion Tables starting from line 143-184 should be rewritten in clear forms. The discussion section still need more strength. Conclusion can be better written. Reference section does not contain up to date	

	reference, the recent reference is on 2006 eight years below the year.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Yasser El-Nahhal*
Department, University & Country	*The Islamic University-Gaza, Palestine*