

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>        |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Original Manuscript_ARJA_117830</b>                       |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Cyanobacterial Contributions on Agriculture– A Review</b> |
| Type of the 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:

<https://journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/editorial-policy>

### **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) |
|--|--|---|
| <p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>Yes, the present study is will be referred in future to study the the agricultural applications of cyanobacteria for improving soil health, plant growth, and agricultural sustainability.</p> <p>The title is suitable.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and adequately addressed.</p> <p>Yes, it is scientifically appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>Yes, references are sufficient.</p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | <p>Some grammatical and word spacing errors exist and need to be fixed.</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>Nil</p>   |   |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**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>Sharad Vitthal Giramkar</b>                     |
| Department, University & Country | <b>PDEA's Annasaheb Magar Mahavidyalaya, India</b> |