SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ MRJI_66676**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Influence of Cropping Practices on the Persistence and Vertical Migration of E. coli in Hydromorph Soil in Dschang West Cameroon**
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/journal/10/editorial-policy)

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	I have gone through the manuscript entitled "**Influence of Cropping Practices on the Persistence and Vertical Migration of *E. coli* in Hydromorph Soil in Dschang West Cameroon"**. I can see that the manuscript carries merit to be published in your reputed journal but after major corrections mentioned below and annotated in the manuscript as well. 1. The authors need to improve the language throughout the manuscript as there are several grammatical and spelling mistakes. 2. The introduction part of the manuscript is too short and there is a lack of recent citations in this part as there is huge literature available on this topic. I have made annotated changes on MS, which authors need to look into. 3. In material and methods portion, there is lack of statistical design approach that was used during the study. 3. In results, Figures and table need improvement as suggested in MS. 4. In discussion part, the Authors need to support their findings with the latest information and there is a need to replace old references/citations with the latest ones as there are too old references/citations used by the authors overall in manuscript. Thanks for writing.	All the suggested correction have been done Checked the suggestion Noted
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)*	