



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Microbiology Research Journal</u>
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	none	
Minor REVISION comments	Last paragraph on page 3: reference to pH is written incorrectly. Page 1, first paragraph of introduction and conclusion, and last paragraph on page 11: the genus name of any species should formally be capitalized. First paragraph on page 6: point after the sentence should start with a capital letter. A just sentence for the argument could be "Some authors [24] found that many ..." Page 6, the phrase "'Compost tea was the most promise bio-products recently programs as plant pest, disease and fertility [25]" Requires grammatical adjustment. The phrase "due to the presence of some microorganisms or there metabolites acted as PGPR and / or as biocontrol agents [32] Their? What is PGPR?" Page 11 Conclusion: "could be used for maximizing vegetative growth characters, fruit yield and its components of Cantaloupe (cucumis melo L.) plants." Please, vegetative growth is	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

	maximized, not the characters.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The approach of the manuscript is not new in regard to the use of Cyanoprokaryota nitrogen fixers (non-toxic) as nutritional enrichment for cultivated plants, but the authors have given the results an adequate treatment, as well as direct and clear. In the methods section, however, they should explain the use of letters to distinguish types of results, because there is no clear guidance to follow the contents of the tables. I recommend a reference on the use of SPAD-501, which seems to be less popular than SPAD-502. A small comment on the consequence with total values of chlorophyll (usually in mg by weight), would favor the argument. Something that needs to be corrected will be the reference No. 3, cited on page 2 (Godd GA, Bell SG, Kaya K, CJ Ward, KA Beattie, Metcalf JS. Cyanobacterial toxins, exposure routes and human health. Eur. J. Phycol 1999; 34: 405-415). It must be a mistake because it is not related at all with this work. It would be enough to eliminate it.	It has been done