Reviewer 2

Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?	Introduction is improved
Is the research design appropriate?	The research design is amended
Are the methods adequately described?	Methods are improved and written clearly
Are the results clearly presented?	The results section was revisited and improved
Are the conclusions supported by the results?	The conclusions of the experiments were improved to support the results.
More information on the mine wastewater should be provided. In the Materials and Method section, some items are actually operating conditions, instead of the methods. Reorganize it if possible.	The method on mine wastewater was revisited and clearly written.
In section 2.8, what the Fo means? It is the initial value of what? Optical density? Clarify it.	It was attended and written clearly
As well as in other sections. In the measurement of Zeta potential, what is the concentration of the background KCl? And what is the pH values? The pH will cause the shift of surface potentials, even change the sign.	1% (v/w) of KCl was used. pH 7 was used. The experiment and results of the effect of pH on flocculating activity of the purified bioflocculant are provided as to reason the choice of using pH 7. This information was not submitted or included in the first submitted copy.
What are the "a" and "b" meaning in Figure 1? The authors may want to more clearly describe the messages in tables and figures.	Different small letters (alphabets) show statistical difference. Their meaning is explained in section;" *2.11. Software and statistical analysis"*
In Figure 4, I understand the pH will change with time, but the initial pH may not be a good term. Delete "initial".	We preferred to use the term "initial pH" as the reviewer also understand that it was not the final pH of the medium. It was the pH at which the medium was adjusted to prior to the start of the experiment or incubation.
Why the scales(magnifications) in Figure 5 are not the same?	It is corrected and new micrograms of good quality are provided.
The peaks in Figure 6 seem not enough, given so many elements in Figure 7	Noted and the experiment on elemental composition was re-done at different sides and the results are included in this revised manuscript.

Why the x range in Figure 8 is 0-600°C, instead of 0-800/900°C? The weight is still decreasing at a temperature of 600 °C. The mechanism of the bioflocculant is not well-proposed. The results only show the biflocculant may behave better than conventional ones. The language needs to be polished carefully. Try to get rid of tense mistakes and clumsy phrases.	It is correct, the temperature used was 600 °C.and NOT 0-800/900°C. The reviewer did not clearly explain the point of concern regarding the discussion of the proposed flocculation mechanisms. However, we revisited our discussion. The manuscript was taken for grammar editing.