

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. This study is interested in the interactions between soil characteristics, plants and microbes that could have positive impacts on forest ecosystems and also on the environment (soil fertility, biomass, plant growth...) 2. Title of the article is suitable 3. Abstract of the article is comprehensive 5. Yes 6. Many references especially concerning the methods are very old.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Yes	
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:	Hafida Zahir
Department, University & Country	University Sultan Moulay Slimane, Morocco