

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_96976
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantification and diversity of cultivated bacteria in root endosphere and rhizosphere of bamboo species Fargesia nitida in association with the tree succession
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.journalmrji.com/index.php/MRJI/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1 - It is important yes. It addresses a topic rarely seen in publications and with all the wealth of methodology and results achieved, it becomes even better 2 - Yes, it is sufficient and suitable 3 - Yes, it's understandable 4 - Very appropriate and favor the reading of the manuscript 5 - Very correct 6 - Yes, they are adequate and recent and they are also in optimal quantity	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it's quality	
Optional/General comments	All topics addressed in this manuscript are well written, well referenced and the authors were able to strongly address the proposed topic, with promising and important results achieved. As a reviewer, I recommend that authors review the legend of figures and tables in the manuscript, taking care to place them in order of number and with the figures and tables that reflect the supplementary material being placed at the end of the figures and tables in the manuscript, with this the organization will be more standard It is recommended that authors also standardize the information contained within the tables in order to favor the readers' understanding.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alan Kelbis Oliveira Lima
Department, University & Country	University of Brasília, Brazil