

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

Compulsory 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.	Cyanobacteria serve as bioindicators. Most of the genera are employed in Phycoremediation that is waste water treatment . It is need of the hour to maintain equilibrium within the ecosystem both marine and fresh water . There is need to educate the scientific community and researchers . In this context I feel that the manuscript submitted is giving information to lay man also	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title chosen is most appropriate and found suitable to the work carried out No need to have any alternate title	
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.	The abstract is up to mark and noteworthy . No inclusions are needed as such nothing is to be deleted	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is comprising sessiions most required such as introduction material and methods, results and discussion, conclusion and references.	
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 submitted for publication in reputed journal is well organized and formatted.The data obtained is interpreted with supportive documentation including graphs tables and figures The style of presentation is lucid and commendable	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes the references mentioned are latest and sufficient to understand the theme of the experimental work undertaken	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the standard of English is easy for communication amongst the peer team of researchers	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Maddela Aruna
Department, University & Country	Telangana University, India