

The research article entitled “**Prediction models of macro-nutrient content in plant organs of *Cucumis melo* in response to soil elements using support vector regression**” is an interesting work provide an efficient approach with potentially high accuracy to estimate macro-nutrient content in fruits of *Cucumis melo* in response to soil elements and hence caused a saving in the amount of fertilizer during the growing season. The article is suitable for publication after proper justification and corrections of given comments.

1. **75-135:** Introduction part should be concise and little brief. The finding of earlier work done presented in introduction from 75 to 135 may be discussed in discussion part rather than in introduction.
2. **160:** nanobiomic foliar application (2 l ha⁻¹); silicone 161 foliar application (3 l ha⁻¹). What are these?
3. **161-162:** mentioned, chemical fertilizer from urea, triple superphosphate, and potassium sulfate sources (200, 100, and 150 kg ha⁻¹) but in line numbers 176-178: Then, a portion of 100 kg ha⁻¹ urea, 100 kg ha⁻¹ triple superphosphate, and 150 kg ha⁻¹ potassium sulfate were distributed and mixed with soil? When was the rest of the quantity of 100kg urea added or applied to crop?
4. What were the sources of nanobiomic biofertilizer?
5. What was the status of soil fertility, particularly soil biological activities? Is it increased after adding *Acetobacter bacillus*, *pseudomonas*, *azosprolium*, 32% humic acid, 2% folic acid?