

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_117361
Title of the Manuscript:	ROLE OF BIOFERTILIZERS - ORGANIC AGRICULTURE
Type of the Article	Review Article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject of the investigation is of great importance due to the search for sustainable and agroecological productions, since the development and use of biofertilizers is considered as an important alternative for the partial or total substitution of mineral fertilizers. 2. It is appropriate. 3. The abstract should include the purpose of the review, literature search methods, main findings, and conclusions. 4. Indicate the model of the review work. Because a systematic review, as in a synthesis review, the structure consists of: Introduction, Material and Methods, Results and Discussion/Conclusions (IMRyD). Meanwhile, the structure of a narrative review consists of the Introduction with the issues to be addressed (research questions and/or objectives), followed by the narrative and reflective development (State of the art), and the Discussion/conclusions. Therefore, I suggest adapting the article to one of the three mentioned models that are accepted in international publications. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. Bibliographic references are adequate, but a review article requires consulting a more up-to-date bibliography, at least from the last 5 years. 7. There are numerous publications that can be consulted so that the manuscript is well prepared, since it must summarize the existing literature, also provide new perspectives and synthesize knowledge to advance the topic of study. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The language used is appropriate and technically correct.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Do not use as keywords those that are already present in the title.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	María Gabriela Di Barbaro
Department, University & Country	National University of Catamarca, Argentina