

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_120947</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Study on Isolation and Characterization of Biofloculant-Producing Bacteria from Wastewater in Sokoto Metropolis, Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>		
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>		
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>		
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>		
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>		
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>		

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>Comments to the Author - <b>A revision is needed.</b></p> <p>This research focuses on biofloculant bacteria isolation and characterization from wastewater. When I read the manuscript, I had a good impression of the work, and I applaud the authors for the sequence and arrangement of ideas and for covering most aspects of the work. However, some comments will enable us to complete the work for publication.</p> <p>The entire work has the potential to be edited to eliminate language mistakes.</p> <p>Rewrite the abstract with the major research findings that reflect the papers' results. The abstract should be concise.</p> <p>Remove bioremediation from the keyword as the manuscript's goal is isolation and characterization.</p> <p>If the format of the abstract is within journal guidelines then it's okay, if not then change the format.</p> <p>In the introduction section, add a similar study carried out by researchers in Nigeria and a few international papers.</p> <p>Write sample processing as Sample collection. How did you transferred samples to lab and at what temperature was maintained till the laboratory transfer? Such as transferred in an insulated ice box at 4 or 8°C.</p> <p>In section 2.1 add a map showing a sample collection point, it will be helpful for the readers. i.e., study area map. Why were these three study areas selected, add a few points related to it. Or else add a study area description before sample collection.</p> <p>In section 2.2, which media composition is written.</p> <p>In section 2.3, use once full form than you can add a shortform of YPG.</p> <p>In section 2.4, rewrite reference [17],[18],[19] as {17-19}. Correct it in the whole manuscript.</p> <p>Re-arrange sections 2.4, 2.5, 2.6. First, add a section of screening of biofloculant-producing bacteria. Then add a section of flocculant activity. At last section is related to the morphological and phenotypic classification of biofloculant-producing bacteria.</p> <p>In table 1, Ph notation is used as pH. Correct it.</p> <p>In table 2, B2 is Rod and ?</p> <p>In the table write samples as Isolates.</p>	

### Review Form 3

	<p>In section 3.2, Isolate A, A<sub>2</sub>, A<sub>3</sub> should be written as A<sub>1</sub>, A<sub>2</sub>, A<sub>3</sub>.</p> <p>If in table isolate name sub script then use the same format accordingly in the whole manuscript.</p> <p>In the discussion section, add a few points regarding the physical properties of wastewater. Discussion needs to be added more.</p> <p>The conclusion similar as abstract needs to be re-written with the major findings of the study. Short and concise. Refer to some good papers for the conclusion.</p> <p>Cross-check references and the in-text format.</p>	
--	--	--

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hardik Giri Gosai</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, India</b>