SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CJAST_51914**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Niche-proxies of soil from rhizosphere of Weeds from Bodo in Gokana, Rivers State, Nigeria.**
Type of the 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:

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

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. However, few corrections could be effected.	**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. This manuscript could be written to conform to the format required by this Journal (CJAST). 2. Some References were not cited under the REFERENCES column at the end of this write-up. Lines 71: (Obiukwu, 2015) ; Line 135: Cheesbrough (2000) ; Line 276: Tesar *et al*., (2002) ; Line 278: Omotayo *et al*., (2014) ; Line 284: Daane *et al*. (2001) ; Lines 285, 289: Ukaegbu-Obi and Mbakwem-Aniebo, (2014) ; Line 286: Van Hamme and Ward, (2001)		The manuscript has been thoroughly modified
Minor REVISION comments **Could effect corrections as follows -** 1. Line 5: Eleven (11) *Cyperus esculentus,* ; Line 20: *florescens* present, ; Could delete 's' as Line 21: support ; Line 26: **1. INTRODUCTION** ; Line 38: These arise from ; Line 44: reviewed articles ; Line 46: these serve as nutrients for ; Line 47: metabolize nutrients ; Line 49: growth promotion in plants ; Line 51: Ahemad (2014) ; Line 52: exist in these regions ; Line 60: plants and were ; Line 61: rhizosphere of plants. ; Line 63: Some are high and others low in molecular ; Line 68: **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS ; 2.1 Study area ;** Line 72: in Rivers State. ; Line 74: which was devastated in ; Line 76: the livelihood of ; Line 77: as Bodo Creek ; Line 78: Other comparative plants and ; Line 92: **2.3 Baseline --- of rhizosphere soil samples** ; Line 93: were carried out. The parameters Line 94: analysed were pH, ; Line 100: method. ; Line 101: **2.4 Enrichment of soil samples ;** Line 102: (Lab M) prepared according ; Line 107: pond water sample ; Line 113: and 15 psi. The media ; Line 116: were counted and judged good ; Line 119: Results for fungal counts ; Line 140: Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.0, ; Line 143: **3. RESULTS** ; Line 154: 0.74 mg/kg and highest 5.6 mg/kg ; Line 157: of 1.1 mg/kg. ; Line 157: was 0.71 and 0.7 for ; Line 169: The results showed ; Line 223: **4. DISCUSSION** Line 234: The pH of ; Line 258: from *A. gangetica* had a total heterotrophic bacterial count (TAHC) of ; Line 260: total fungal count (TFC), 4.76 Log_{10}Cfu/g for hydrocarbon utilizing fungal count (HUFC), while hydrocarbon utilizing bacterial count (HUBC) was 5.16 ; Line 261: had hydrocarbon utilizing bacterial (HUB) and total heterotrophic bacterial count (THBC) of 5.79 Log ; Line 280: Furthermore, the studies of Orhorhoro et al. (2018) and that of other earlier studies were able to ; Line 295: **5. CONCLUSION** Line 296: of plants are affected ; Line 297: The quality of exudates ; Line 299: The pH ; Line 300: hence encouraged only a narrow ; Line 306: **RECOMMENDATION** Line 310: could play veritable roles ; Line 312: **REFERENCES ;** Lines 322 to 323:could remove 'bolden' Line 362: in Momoge		The corrections have been done according to the suggestions of the reviewer
Optional/General comments Good work, could take pains to effect necessary corrections.		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	