Dear respected authors

I am so pleased to review your paper. All papers submitted here should visit standard criteria before publishing. In this regard, I posted some comments on paper content that should be answered clearly. Please provide an answer sheet to reply all queries line-by-line. Please highlight corrections in different colors when the revised file will be submitted.

1- Please consider all PeerJ criteria to prepare the final style of manuscript structure

2- In line 246, Please check the spelling of English words. It is better that the respected authors do some grammatical corrections in this file.

3- Please add enough references to M&M section for all discussed subtitles

4- In lines 130 and 132: the respected authors wrote (soil: extract, 1:5 and soil: water = 1:5). Please write uniformly using the same symbols.

5- In line 139, what is the criteria for choosing 53 µm aperture sieve. Please explain it in the appropriate part.

6- In discussion section; not all parameters were discussed properly. For example, there is no discussion about the effect of pH on the characteristics of different plantations. This section should be rewritten.

7- In lines 232-243; the respected authors just explained about young plantations, please give some information about mature plantations too. How this phase might affect the quality of analyzed data?

8- In lines 244-249; according to your discussion, it seems that in mature plantations, due to the presence of more roots and more root exudates there should be more sources of carbon for the growth and reproduction of microbes. Please explain this paragraph more clearly.

9- In line 247 the respected authors mentioned (the higher root exudates of middle-aged plantations), the question is: what is the reason that root exudates of middle-aged plantations are higher than the others? please explain it more clearly.

10- Letters on the error bars in figure 2 should be corrected.

11- Please improve the quality of all illustrations in the manuscript body.