



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>)



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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 <i>Moringa Oleifera</i> when you have to write <i>Moringa oleifera</i>. - 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. 	
Minor REVISION comments	You should respect the references style proposed by the author guidelines.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nidhal Marzougui
Department, University & Country	National Research Institute for Rural Engineering, Water and Forests, Tunisia