



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_29944
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF CYANOBACTERIA FILTRATE, COMPOST TEA AND DIFFERENT RATES OF NITROGEN FERTILIZER ON GROWTH, FRUIT YIELD AND QUALITY OF CANTALOUPE PLANTS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

	ii. Line 7: pH and not PH Results and discussion a. 2nd paragraph i. Line 10: the two reasons were not stated ii. The last two sentences are not related to what was being discussed in that paragraph b. 3rd paragraph i. Line 8: it seems there are omissions in the sentence 'compost tea was ... and fertility [25],' ii. Last sentence in paragraph 3 was not part of your findings since you did not determine chlorophyll content at different stages of growth. c. 4th paragraph i. Recast in order to convey meaning. ('In the other hand ... of culture') Effect of nitrogen levels on yield i. Line 5: There is no data on unfertilized control in the Tables shown. ii. Line 7: Fruit number and number of fruits are two different things. iii. Line 8: The sentence, 'These results seemed ... pathogens [33]. is not the focus of discussion here but may be better appreciated if it appeared under 'Effect of foliar application of bio-organic fertilizers on yield. iv. Instead of F-test being included in the Tables, the LSD values would have been more appropriate. Conclusion Conclude based on your findings and not from previous results.	It has been done It has been done It has been done It has been done It has been done
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Abstract i. Line 7, delete 'in' (... increased in vegetative) ii. Line 8, delete 'which gave' and replace with 'with' iii. Abstract is usually one paragraph Introduction i. Ist name in generic name should be capitalized ii. Full citation of a reference should appear in the reference list. An example is the reference of FAO Materials and methods i Table foot note: '** soil past extract' is not clear ii. There is no reference to Table 2 in the text. iii. Was harvest after 55 days? iv. Line 1 of last paragraph delete 'crashed' and replace with 'crushed' Results and discussion a. 1st paragraph i. Line 7: delete 'dray' and replace with 'dry' ii. Line 10 should read: 'and the plants sprayed with ...' b. 2nd paragraph i. Line 6: delete ' leaves fresh weight' (it was repeated) ii. Line 9: delete 'nitrogen' c. 3rd paragraph i. Line 2: delete 'interaction' ii. Line 3: delete 'At the' Effect of foliar application of bio-organic fertilizers on yield a. 1st Paragraph i. Line 1: remove the brackets: (5and 6); delete 'cleared' and replace with 'showed'. Also insert 'of' after application. ii. Line 2: use the adverb of high i.e. highly iii. Line 5: delete 'either'. b. 2nd Paragraph i. Line 3: delete nutritional and replace with nutrient. ii. Line 7: merge '[18] and [31] since the crop is same i.e. soybean.	It has been done It has been done It has been done It has been done It has been done It has been done It has been done It has been done It has been done It has been done
---------------------------------------	---	---

	Effect of bio-organic fertilizer spraying and nitrogen levels interaction on yield i. Line 5 should read ‘foliar spray with cyanobacteria filtrate + compost tea + 240 kg N ha⁻¹ ... ii. Line 10: It seems there are omissions in this sentence ‘Apparently, ... and its components’ References What is ‘Z’ in ref. 1? Delete ‘PP’ and replace with colon (:)	It has been done It has been done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		