



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BMRJ/2302
Title of the Manuscript:	Population Variance and Diversity of Endophytic Bacteria in Soybean (Glycine max (L) Merrill) Cultivated in Vertisol.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	To my knowledge this is a original paper. The works lacks novelty. However the study have potential interest, and after more research it can be considered for publication. The assessment of the number of endophytic bacteria in different parts of the plant is interesting although as the authors recognize it is not new, and therefore, this is not enough for publication in an international journal. If the authors identify the isolates by a more sound procedure (sequention of the 16S rRNA gene), then the article would merit publication, as probably they would find some interesting information about the differential (or not!) distribution of bacterial taxa in different parts of the plant and different development stages, or even the would describe by the first time the presence of certain taxa in plants, and this would open a door to investigate, why they are there. But the identification system adopted by the authors, based on morphology and physiology is not sound enough to be accepted. The authors recognise that this is a tentative identification, but in this time it is not adequate not even for a tentative identification in an international journal. Try www.macrogen.com for a service of complete identification. • Materials & methods This part is insufficiently explicit.	Yes I agree. But the reports on the distribution of endophytic population in different parts as well as at different growth stages are very few. Hence present work was undertaken. Currently, the isolates obtained are being processed for screening of plant growth promotion and biocontrol properties and the efficient isolates will be identified by molecular techniques. As per comments corrections are made in the manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	How many plants were sampled? In how many fields? Please, indicate the soil analysis of each sampled field. In my opinion, the sample could be adequate, but we do not know if it is, because it is not described. • Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? As indicated before it would be necessary a more detailed explanation about the sample process and the it would be possible to answer to this point. 2. Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion. I would recommend to update the references used. During the last few years it has been published extensive information about the endophytic bacteria as PGPR. The author can find some interesting references if the search based in the key word 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. In my opinion, discussion should be based in the biodiversity of bacteria isolated, and this need of a identification of the bacteria. (See final general	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	comment). 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?) It would be necessary a statistical approach to see if the differences observed between plant source are different as the authors claim. • Conclusion Conclusions are very poor. They refer to biocontrol, but this has not been discussed in the text • Are all the references cited relevant and adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite? I responded to this question before. Please, make a revision based on PGPR, you will find very interesting information	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Please, check the reference of Rosenblueth. Please revise English for example 3.2 second paragraph	
Optional/General comments	I encourage the authors to continue with the work in the indicated direction. Please, understand that in the present moment identification based only in morphological, cultural and biochemical characteristics, can not be accepted. Of course you have many isolates, so sequentiation of all of them may not be viable. So, use a method to find groups of accession belonging to the same taxon.	