

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_100931
Title of the Manuscript:	Occurrence of foodborne bacteria with outbreak potentials and fungi associated with tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> L.) in postharvest
Type of the 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.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, is important since tomato is a economically important crop around the world hence its potential to create an outbreak 2. Yes, it is suitable. 3. Yes, is comprehensive. 4. Yes, it is appropriate. However, there is no statistical analysis in it to tell if there is any significant difference between fresh tomato and spoiled tomato. 5. No, there is more to say about contamination due spoilage and postharvest contamination. There are several factors to take into account, author should revised bibliography to look deeper into a reason why exist this type of spoilage (bacteria, mould, etc) 6. No, author must discuss further the results obtained. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	There are some grammar and spelling errors	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There is no statistical analysis. I think that images are necessary in this paper. For every microbial analysis it should be an explanation (i.e. fungal isolation, microbial isolation, microbial quantification) Proofreading services are required</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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Teresa Gladys Cerón Carrillo
Department, University & Country	Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, México