**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=sci-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

### PART 1: Review Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Compulsory **REVISION comments** | Line 24 to 77  
Introduction need to be rewritten. Need to be more organised...flocculation, flocculants, types -chemicals and their disadvantages, bioflocculants and their advantages, microbes producing .  
147 line: inoculated and some were incubated  
202 line: abattoir effluent showed highest activity which is not in correlation with the graph |
| Minor **REVISION comments** | References are not correctly formatted throughout  
- Journal names should be either full or abbreviated  
- journal name . or ,  
- journal names are not italicized  
- after volume , or :  
- 487 line : Tamura, |
| Optional/General comments | 84 line : Why potato dextrose and nutrient broth in one media |
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