

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Archives of Current Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ACRI_129040</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Microbial diversity of bacterial species (Rhizobium and Azospirillum) under different land used systems</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<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>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The paper makes <b>a meaningful contribution to the scientific community</b> . It provides valuable insights into the interaction between different agroforestry land use systems and microbial diversity, which is very important in understanding soil ecosystem health issues and sustainability. The results increase knowledge of how agroforestry land use systems affect microbial community and soil health, guiding land management and soil remediation strategies.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The <b>title</b> is general. I suggest the following slightly modified title: Microbial diversity of bacterial species ( <i>Rhizobium</i> and <i>Azospirillum</i> ) under different Agroforestry land use systems.	
<b>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.</b>	The <b>abstract</b> lacks some parts. I suggest the following additional parts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A short sentence of general background of the study at the beginning of the abstract</li> <li>- A short sentence of conclusion of the study at the end of the abstract.</li> <li>- A short sentence of recommendation or policy or practical implication of research output just after the conclusion.</li> </ul>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The <b>introduction</b> does not include a sufficient review of directly related literatures. I do not also see a clear statement of the problem, objectives and the study's significance in it.  In the <b>material and methods</b> study design, treatment allocations, and statistical data analysis method, software used have not been mentioned directly.  The <b>result and discussion</b> section, results have not been interpreted sufficiently, and they have also not been placed in context of existing researches. No similar and contrasting research have been mentioned in the discussion, except in one or two places. No highlights of implications, limitations and future research directions are shown in the it.  In the <b>tables</b> , it is better if statistical differences in variables are shown using small or capital letter.  The <b>conclusion</b> should be rewritten. It does not well summarize key findings. The practical and policy implication of the results and recommendations are not indicated.  The <b>references</b> are not consistent (eg. Some publication year is parentheses, some are not). One citation style should be followed thoroughly. It is better if citation softwares such as Mendeley or Zetero can be used for consistency and accuracy.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The <b>refences</b> are sufficient but not recent. I suggest inclusion of very recent refences in it.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	I found <b>no language issue</b> in it; the quality of English is more than sufficient.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Including some recent empirical studies on "status of microbial diversity in different agroforestry land use systems" as a very short review in the introduction would greatly improve the manuscript.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Miftha Beshir Bune</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Arsi University College of Agriculture and Environmental Science, Ethiopia</b>