SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Microbiology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMB_51293**
Title of the Manuscript:	**COMPARATIVE EFFECTS OF CONVENTIONAL AND NON-CONVENTIONAL FLOCCULANTS AND DISINFECTANTS ON MICROBIAL CONTAMINANTS IN WATER PURIFICATION**
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)

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	- **The abstract is not well structured. I advised you to follow the abstract model presented in the author guidelines.** - **You have to specify in the summary and in the introduction which flocculants are conventional and which are non conventional.** - **You had not presented Moringa seeds flocculant results and you must not use references in the abstract.** - **In the abstract, you wrote *Moringa Oleifera* when you have to write *Moringa oleifera*.** - **I think you have to review the key words.** - **The description of study area must be cited in the materials and methods section.** - **Review the introduction: when you mention a point, you have to write about it once for all and not come back several times (for example: for water pollution, you have to define it in only one paragraph and not write each time "this is characterized...".** - **When you analyse a figure, you should do it once for all and not speak about it, pass to the other and come back to the first (that was the case of figures 4 and 5 in the pages 19 and 26).** - **You had not presented the chlorine treatment results as you did for alum in table 1, bioflocculant in table 2 and Moringa seeds in table 3.** - **The manuscript contains a very high number of figures and tables (18 > 15 which was the number evocated in the author guidelines). So I suggest to combine the tables 1, 2 and 3 in one great table and consequently, the table analysis should consists to comparison between treatments and concentrations to finally distinguishing which were the best treatment and the best concentration.** - **Moreover, I suggest combining the tables 4 and 5 in one table, same thing for the tables 6 and 7 and also 8 and 9.**	The manuscript has been modified thoroughly
Minor REVISION comments	**You should respect the references style proposed by the author guidelines.**	
Optional/General comments		

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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