



## SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

### PART 1:

|                          |                                                                                                                       |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">British Microbiology Research Journal</a>                                                                 |
| 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. |

### PART 2:

| FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Authors' response to final evaluator's comments |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| <p>This manuscript has been improved in the new reversion, but it is still not good enough for publication. My main concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Same as that mentioned in the first review (point 2), some methods are not clear, such as 2) how the authors selected the isolates or defined the morphotypes? 3) How to calculate the CFU/g of plant tissue?</li> <li>2. Same as that mentioned in the first review (point 3), the authors did not give any evidence to support their identification of the bacteria. If the data are too much to present in the manuscript, a supplementary table may be included to show the grouping results and the main evidence or characters for the identification of each group.</li> <li>3. In discussion, only the previous studies were mentioned, but they are not used to explain the results of this work, or they have no relation to the results of this work.</li> <li>4. There are still many minor errors, which have been indicated in the first time of review, such as the used of "sp."</li> <li>5. In several cases, the authors mentioned "morphotypes were isolated". I guess this refers to isolates. Morphotypes can be identified or defined, but not isolated. Then, if you really mean morphotypes, you have to give the method how they were defined.</li> </ol> <p>More comments and modifications have been put in the reversion.</p> |                                                 |

### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |                                                                                                                |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | En Tao Wang (ET Wang)                                                                                          |
| Department, University & Country | Departamento de Microbiología, Escuela Nacional de Ciencias Biológicas, Instituto Politécnico Nacional, México |