

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_97615
Title of the Manuscript:	A consortium of soil bacteria mediates the partial replacement of mineral fertilizer for sustainable grapevine cultivation 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.journalbj.com/index.php/BJI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>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)</p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript important for scientific community. The authors communicate ecological fertilization solutions to the vine. The exposed solutions seem to improve productivity and decrease costs.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. It is a little too detailed (a little longer than the limit allowed, 318 words to 300). Part of the abstract can be integrated into conclusions.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsection and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The numbering of subsections must be restored.</p> <p>5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. For certainty, photos of the experimental locations, comparative images of the plants that have been applied to different treatments, and images of the measurement operations are also needed. Without these, there are doubts about carrying out experiments in the best conditions.</p> <p>6. Yes, the references sufficient and recent. Under these conditions, the publication can only be done after: 1) Making English and scientific significance corrections; 2) Explanation of all abbreviations; 3) Introducing a minimum number of supporting images of experiments.</p> <p>After satisfying these conditions, a new review is recommended.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language must be improved, but also the scientific language, which has little deficiencies and must be corrected. For these reasons we suggest: 1) control and corrections using the facilities of the text editor (Word); 2) control and corrections using the Grammarly Free Version program or a higher version; 3) Control with the Quillbot program, which also suggests simplifications and semantic corrections, see the web page: https://quillbot.com/grammar-checker?utm_medium=paid_search&utm_source=google&utm_campaign=dsa_developing&campaign_type=search</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>We suggested the introduction in the text of the manuscript of supplements that characterize modern articles:</p> <p>1) a map (classic or gis) that presents the position of experimental plantations in the country or the region in which the experiments are carried out-this can be a basic element in the future elaboration of a GIS database;</p> <p>2) images from the experimental plots, respectively the vineyards in which the treatments, the rejection with the bacteria, the administration mode, and the comparative images between the plants with different treatments and the witness plants - in two years it is impossible not to take some photos; (Even in the article's references there are examples: [5], [17], [49], etc.)</p> <p>3) Graphic representations for the status results, which help understand the results and interpretations and increase their speed, making the article easier and more pleasant to read (Even in the article's references there are examples: [30], [33], [45], [49], [66], etc.).</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cardei Petru
Department, University & Country	INMA, Romania