

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Microbiology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMB_122284</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Use of Bacterial Biofertilizers in Tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> L.) Cultivation</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Experimental</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The importance is that new strains of bacteria have been used. However, the source (collection) of their receipt is not indicated. If the authors selected them independently, the publication should be indicated. If there is none, then the method of their selection, study of microbiological characteristics and identification should be added to the article. It is also important that the data were obtained for tomato plants. However, the growing conditions are not specified - temperature, humidity, type of soil. The results of the study were not compared with other publication for tomatoes with the same bacterial species. The literature used by the authors is outdated. The method of obtaining pure mushroom cultures should be rewritten. The figures should also show the confidence interval (error of the mean value).</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>You should check the grammar of the writing</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, but the method of obtaining pure mushroom cultures should be rewritten</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The authors note that statistical processing of the results was carried out. Photo material is presented. There is data analysis and comparison with the results of other authors.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The publication of the strains used must be indicated. New, up-to-date literature should also be used, in particular, that related to tomato plants and the same bacterial species used by the authors of this article.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	I am not an English-speaking scholar. However, the article should be carefully read, as there are errors (repetition of words, incorrect expressions, incorrectly used words or terms).	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1) Check the text for errors (repetition of words, incorrect expressions, incorrectly used words or terms). 2) Rewrite the method of obtaining pure mushroom cultures, taking into account the comments (see the text of the article). 3) The figures should also show the confidence interval (error of the mean value). 4) In the captions to figures 11-18, specify the magnification of the microscope and the staining method. 5) The literature used for the Introduction and Discussion is outdated. More modern literary sources should be analyzed and added to the work. In particular, the sources regarding the effectiveness of the studied species of bacteria on tomato plants have not been analyzed (such sources are already available on the Internet). 6) The Discussion should be rewritten, in particular, due to the poorly used expressions that begin the sentences: [29] showed....., [30] to show..., [31] to prove. 7) See comments in the text of the article	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i> No	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Nataliia Tkachuk</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>T.H. Shevchenko National University "Chernihiv Colehium", Ukraine</b>