

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_89347
Title of the Manuscript:	Culture based isolation and characterization of Endophytic Bacteria isolated from the roots and leaves of Mangrove plants <i>Avicennia germinans</i> (Black mangrove), <i>Acrostichum aureum</i> (golden leather fern) and <i>Rhizophora mangle</i> (Red mangrove).
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:

(<https://www.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>1. I appreciate that the title should be shorter and concise. For instance, the popular name of the species is not necessary here. So, I suggest: Culture on Nutritive Media and Characterization of Some Endophytic Bacteria Isolated from the Roots and Leaves of Mangrove Plants: <i>Avicennia germinans</i>, <i>Acrostichum aureum</i> and <i>Rhizophora mangle</i></p> <p>ABSTRACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Past tense should be used. The aim of this study was.....This study employed..... - Now, you can write also the popular name for each species (at their first apparition), especially that at the Results we can see thatred mangrovewas used. -.....in old Port Harcourt township of Rivers State, Nigeria..... - I suggest: From the roots, the hydrocarbon utilizing bacteria counts ranged from 7.0×10^3cfu/g – 1.6×10^4cfu/g, while the that of the leaves ranged from 3.0×10^5cfu/g – 8.0×10^5cfu/g. The nitrogen fixing bacteria counts for roots ranged from 4.5×10^3cfu/g – 1.0×10^4cfu/g and that of the leaves ranged from 3.0×10^5cfu/g – 6.0×10^5cfu/g. Nitrifying bacteria counts for the roots ranged from 5.0×10^3cfu/g – 7.0×10^3cfu/g, while the counts from the leaves ranged from 3.5×10^5cfu/g - 5.0×10^5cfu/g. -...isolates was in the following order:..... - In fact, the isolates species have been already specified just above. Please, do not repeat the information. - In the Abstract the abbreviations should be explained first. Please pay attention. <p>Keywords: Please, not bold, as I just have seen in a recent published paper. Italic is necessary.</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please respect Instructions for authors. <p>In this case:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [2]. So, it is correct here ? - At the end of the Introduction section, please specify the study objectives. <p>2.MATERIALS AND METHODS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The indications for the Figures (1.2.3) should be done in text. - Bold, for the Figures titles. - I suggest: Isolation of microorganisms - Statistical analysis <p>Is recommended.</p> <p>3.RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Table 1 Why sometimes with CFU and other times cfu? Please use the same every time. - $3.0 \times 10^3 \pm 0.00$ not $3.0 \pm \times 10^3 \pm 0.00$ - Not bold here (for Legend). - Not the same font size as above. - Please see Instructions for authors. - Please specify also, The values are means\pmSD or \pmSE?? - I appreciate that it is not necessary to repeat the data that can be seen inside the Table 1. Moreover, you can specify if are there some marcant differences (even statistically differences should be interpreted) between the samples. - As concern, at material and Methods, at the end.....Statistical analysis.....is missing. - The name of the Table 2 should be placed above. - Because there are many abbreviations inside the table, please use a Legend...below the table with a view to explain them. - Table 3 4?....not 6? - Legend.....not italic - I recommend to place the text before the Table 3. 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>- We can see the situation inside the Table 3. Please, you can done an explanation, but not a repetition.</p> <p>- The Figure 4 title should be placed below the Figure. This graph reflects in fact the same situation as in the Figure 3. If so, please do not repeat the information and do not use the Figure 4 (for which I did not found any indication inside the text). You can place also the corresponding percentage, when the sum has been written (by using SUM/PERCENTAGE FROM TOTAL),</p> <p>- Italic, please: Klebsiella, Pantoea, 3 Vibrio, 2 Enterobacter, Pseudomonas, Virgibacillus, Staphylococcus, and 8 Bacillus</p> <p>- ...in the carbon (C), nitrogen (N), or phosphorus (P) cycles</p> <p>4. CONCLUSION</p> <p>REFERENCES</p> <p>- Please respect Instructions for authors. Please verify every reference. Example: Gulson BL, Mizon KJ, Korsch MJ, Howarth D. Non-orebody sources are significant contributors to blood lead of some children with low to moderate lead exposure in a major lead mining community. Science of Total Environment. 1996;181:223–230.</p> <p>- If we look inside the text, the second Reference should be: James et al., 2013....</p>	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Delian Elena
Department, University & Country	University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania