



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_BMRJ_14379
Title of the Manuscript:	Phenotypic and genotypic characteristics of phosphate solubilizing rhizobacteria isolated from faba bean rhizosphere in Meknes region, Morocco
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The manuscript can be considered for publication but requires some important changes and improvements. First, the minor changes which are marked in the revised version must be included (see mark notes in the accompanying revised manuscript). Second, in my opinion, Figure 2 (and the corresponding comments) does not add anything new to the well-known phenomenon of P-solubilization mediated by acidification of the cell surroundings (possibly as a consequence of organic acid production). Therefore this figure (and the related comments) should be deleted from the manuscript. This holds also true to Figure 1. Third, I strongly suggest repeating the P-solubilizing experiments performed in NBRIP medium to record the size of the solubilization halos at significantly shorter periods of time. Incubation for 10, 20 and 30 days in solid NBRIP is too much time for this experiment and may suffer from several flaws (dehydration of the medium, strong acidification of the colony surroundings, nutritional stress of the cells, contamination with other bacteria, etc). The reference invoked by the authors to support this experimental approach is neither a valid reference on the field or easily available through the Internet. Besides, this Manual is more related with soil chemical and biochemical properties than with soil microorganism's biological functions. On the other hand, these tests are very easy to perform and, as the authors said, solubilization halos are visible "...in the NBRIP agar after 72-120 h of growth at 27 °C." Fourth, attention must be given to the <i>identification</i> of the PSB isolates by sequencing of the 16S rDNA, and particularly to the results presented in Table 4: the information provided (GenBank Accession Number and Length of the sequence) is misleading and actually corresponds to the sequences already available in this database. This is not correct: the authors should provide the information concerning <u>their own sequences</u> to be able to confirm (or not!) their conclusions. At best, these sequences should be deposited in a public database. Fifth, and considering that a disc diffusion assay was performed to test antibiotic resistance, quantitative results must be provided. Discussion of the most important and significant results must be improved (see accompanying manuscript)!	- This part was deleted - also you are absolutely right, we have already repeated this experiment but was modified incubation time instead of 10, 20 and 30 days has been made by 3, 5 and 7 days and was obtained almost them even results (look at table 1 it was modified) - If you will, sir, you are absolutely right This part was corrected in the manuscript: • Our 16S rRNA gene sequences data of isolates were deposited in the GenBank nucleotide sequence database under the accessions numbers: KF465842, KF465836, KF432826, KF360080 - our study is not interested to the quantitative assessment, we are only interested to the qualitative assessment which was substituted by the quantitative evaluation values including the inhibition distances(ID) - it was added