

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.	The manuscript "Effects Of Cadmium On A Marine Cyanobacteria" is a significant work in the field of Applied Microbiology. The authors have thoroughly studied the use of Cyanobacteria in remediation of heavy metal Cadmium in marine ecosystem. Also authors have investigated the effect of Cadmium on photosynthetic pigment produced by Cyanobacteria.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the paper is precise, descriptive and gives the information about the research work.	
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 of the paper is brief and informative. The authors have summarized the main points concisely using adequate number of words.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the structure of the manuscript is proper and arranged in the correct order.	
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.	As the authors have implemented pertinent procedures and appropriately interpreted the experimental data, the work is scientifically accurate. The experimental work is conducted using established procedures, and the results are presented as tables and graphs. With appropriate citations, the findings of both recent and earlier research have been adequately understood.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes, there is uniformity in Citing References in the Text	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the paper is good and scientific.	
Optional/General comments	Article is suitable for publication in journal.	

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:	Sarika Kulkarni
Department, University & Country	Yashwantrao Mohite College, India