

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125932
Title of the Manuscript:	Morphological, Biochemical and Molecular Characterization of Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria with Synergistic Effect Against <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i>
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The use of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria is particularly relevant, especially when it comes to improvements in plant production	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The species name " <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> " should be italicized in the title.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	In the summary, I suggest that you can explain the methodology better, to do this reduce the context a little.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In the subsection "2.4 Biochemical Characterization of PGPR", remove the indentation, since none of the other sections have it. 2) In the subsection "3.3.3 Phylogenetic tree construction", since this is another step, I suggest that you start with the numbering 3.4 and so on. 3) Since the "DISCUSSION" section is separate from the results, it should be numbered with number 4, and conclusion with 5. 4) Likewise, the conclusion section should remove the indentation. 5) The spacing of the "DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)" section should be revised. 	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Characterization assessments are challenging when dealing with isolates of microorganisms. The authors were able to identify new strains that could contribute significantly, not only to enriching the database, but also for application in agriculture in the face of environmental degradation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	I suggest a brief review of the references to adapt them to the journal's standards. It is recommended that authors bring as many current references as possible from the last 5 years. I suggest this reference "JESUS, A.L.N; BRITO, N. D. S. ; MEDEIROS, M.J ; OLIVEIRA, A. S. ; LIMA, A. L. A. . Plant Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria Promote anatomical adjustments in the leaves of native Caatinga species under water deficit. JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND PROGRESS, v. 7, p. 104-116, 2022.' An important and recent study on the use of Plant Growth-Promoting Rhizobacteria, which may especially help in the state of the art of the work.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English is adequate	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Angela Lucena Nascimento De Jesus
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Ceara, Brazil