

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_123572
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of UV- B absorbing compound in terrestrial cyanobacterium <i>Leptolyngbya</i> sp. CN1
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **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

<b>Compulsory</b> 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.	There has been some work on exploring MAAs from cyanobacteria. This study explores a cyanobacteria which is naturally exposed to strong sunlight. This environmental factor may have positive effect on the properties of MAAs isolated with previously isolated ones. I found this work interesting for its commercial application value.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I don't think the title is suitable. Alternative title: "Isolation and characterization of terrestrial cyanobacterium producing commercially important UV-B absorbing compound"	
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.	Yes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
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 methods and procedure adopted was scientifically correct. The table, figure etc are well documented. Apart from the discussion part, which I think should contain quantitative comparison between already studied MAAs from other cyanobacteria and the one in this study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need to improve English in different parts. Both quality and grammar needs improvement.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The discussion part should contain quantitative comparison between already studied MAAs from other cyanobacteria and the one in this study. Points should be included showing similarity/dissimilarity/uniqueness of the MAAs studied here with the previously studied.	

**Review Form 3**

**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>Gargi Saha Kesh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Vijaygarh Jyotish Ray College, India</b>