

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_123847
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects Of Cadmium On A Marine Cyanobacteria
Type of the Article	Short communication

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

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	Cadmium pollution is a major environmental concern due to its adverse effects on all life forms on this planet. The topic of research is worth investigation; however, the findings of the study are not positive. The authors should highlight in the abstract and discussion section how the findings of the present work will be helpful for those who are working on the same aspect.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title can be modified to cover specific information about manuscript "Adverse physiological effects of cadmium on a marine cyanobacterium isolate"	
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.	Although the abstract of the article is comprehensive, the authors should mention in brief the negative effect of cadmium on parameters considered in the investigation, i.e., chlorophyll, phycobiliproteins, biomass, etc.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Structure of the manuscript is appropriate	
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.	The manuscript is precise; however, authors should elaborate methodology specifically for phycobiliprotein estimation. In discussion, authors should clarify why they have selected these parameters of the physiology of cyanobacteria in their study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Latest reference is from 2021, authors should include additional 2-3 recent references.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is suitable for scholarly communications	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Manuscript can be considered for publication after incorporation of the of the above suggestions in the manuscript.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ashish Jain
Department, University & Country	University of Mumbai, India