

Response to Reviewer 3 Comments

1. Summary

Dear Reviewer 3,

we highly appreciate your time spent reviewing our manuscript. Your feedback has been valuable, and we have made efforts to incorporate it into the text according to your suggestions. Please find the revised manuscript attached. The present document addressing the queries should help you navigate the corrected sections in the text. Please track changes (line numbers) in the document titled 'manuscript - with revisions'.

With best wishes, authors

2. Questions for General Evaluation

Reviewer's Evaluation

Response and Revisions

Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?

Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable

Are all the cited references relevant to the research?

Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable

Is the research design appropriate?

Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable

Are the methods adequately described?

Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable

Are the results clearly presented?

Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable

Are the conclusions supported by the results?

Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable

3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Comment 1: "Abstract is too long, please summarize well and rewrite the abstract"

Response 1: Thank you for this note; we agree with it. The abstract has been trimmed of redundant information regarding methodology and results not directly related to the impact of the used inoculants on the tested crops.

Comment 2: "Please rewrite the 'Keywords': what is PGPMs? And why authors choose vitamin C as the key word?"

Response 2: PGPMs stands for 'plant growth promoting microorganisms.' This abbreviation was

used because it is widely recognized among researchers in this field. The abbreviation is further explained in the introduction (lines 68-72). Vitamin C was included due to its notable impact resulting from both inoculants on some of the tested crops. However, as other parameters also demonstrated significant effects from the inoculant, this specific keyword was omitted.

Comment 3: “Line82, ‘phyot-ohormones’ should be ‘phyto-hormones’”

Response 3: It was corrected, thank you for noticing this mistake.

Comment 4: “Line145, ‘0,4%’ described as ‘0.4%’ may be a good choice, please check and revise them throughout the manuscript”

Response 4: The entire manuscript has been revised from this perspective; thank you for bringing it to our attention.

Comment 5: “The contents of Table 1 contain the Figure 2’ content, please revise”

Response 5: Thank you for the notification, we are aware of this. The data in the tables represent a summary of average values including standard deviations for quick orientation in the results, while the graphs highlight the most interesting findings where significant differences have been observed.

Comment 6: “Figure 4 and Figure 5 may look better horizontally than vertically”

Response 6: We are aware of this; unfortunately, the graphs are rectangular in shape, making it challenging to arrange them side by side with captions. Additionally, microscopic images are more square-shaped, making it difficult to better organize the page.

Once again, we extend our gratitude for your time invested in reviewing our manuscript, authors