

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_100573
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of Cyanobacteria on Peanut Plants Development Characteristics and Production in Sandy Soil
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:

(<https://www.journalbjournal.com/index.php/BJI/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Protecting the environment, preserving natural resources and finding biofertilizers and biopesticides friendly to the environment is a goal of the international scientific community. 2. The title of the manuscript is suggestive of the addressed problem. In the introduction, the need for biofertilizers for a basic crop in the region is described and the purpose of the manuscript is well highlighted. 3. The summary is clear and corresponds to the requirements of the journal. The methodology is detailed or, if necessary, is accompanied by the appropriate bibliographical references. 4. The manuscript is structured in sections and subsections, but their numbering must be checked and corrected. 5. The results are relevant and respond to current requirements. 6. There is a wide range of bibliographic references, among which there are also more recent references. I recommend the addition competing interests and authors' contributions	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	-	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Borozan Aurica
Department, University & Country	University of Life Sciences "King Mihai I" from Timisoara, Romania