Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_53471**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effectiveness of Azospirillum brasilense inoculants to wheat (Triticum aestivum) in the micro-region of Curitibanos (SC).**
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	**General comments:** **The article deals with an important agricultural subject, relevant to the international community but describe an assay to a micro-region…..;** **But it is the result of a single experiment; only on cultivar; conducted under field conditions; only one place; only one growing season; only one place/region.** **It does clearly write the hypothesis;** **It does clearly write the work aim.** **The writing must be revised in a depth English scientific style (grammar, orthography, American or British…)** **Must be revise all symbols and abbreviations, like Trio x TBIO, etc...** **The article is not properly formatted according to the template available on the journal's website.** **Very oldest citation and references from 1995 to 2018, a gap of good international articles (with journal impacts).** **The assay carried out a xxx growing season (lack date);** **Lack important information's about assay managements** **Lack important information's traits evaluated (more details and descriptions)** **The authors must be checking rigorously the authors guidelines;** **In general, the results are fragile to a robust and categoric conclusions showed** **The experiment performed lack an innovative scientific news.** **ABSTRACT – lack an informative numeric relevant about traits measured; but there is writing the objective in a clear manner.** **INTRODUCTION-writing in a good structure, actual citations and references, but are so short, only two paragraphs.** **METHODOLOGY- reorganize the text and topics (see guidelines and as a word template). Reorder as a logical or chronological procedure.** **Lack a writing the grain yield potential as function of all management practices.** **Statistical analysis: robust and elegant procedure are applied.** **Lack writing in split in a main topic, as subtitles, as a template…** **Lack described/detailed all management practices performed.** **Lack described/detailed about the traits evaluated and procedures performed.** **Statistical analysis: robust and elegant procedure are applied.** **Lack the climatic information's, like temperatures, rainfall, solar radiation during plant growth…** **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS…** **The citations not follow authors guidelines, see recent published article or template.** **The figures are showed as 3D, but it's not necessary, because effective and technical at 2D, y and x axes. (not Z)** **All article the citation and references not according to authors guidelines/authors instruction….** **The authors must revise particularly data's on figure 1, about dry weight, grain yield, are very low…** **REFERENCES:** **bad adjust to authors guidelines and references rules, see template…**	The manuscript has been revised and modified considering all the comments of the reviewer

Minor REVISION comments		
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	