



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BMRJ/2520
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and Molecular Characterization of Lactic Acid Bacteria Isolated from Fresh Fruits and Vegetables using Nested PCR Analysis

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

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

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	• It is not clear the application of the resulting data. Although the characterization of LAB is interesting, the source of isolation considered in this study is not typically reported to be fermented, while LAB are known to be relevant in food fermentation. On the contrary, LAB may act as spoilage microorganisms in several non-fermented foods. What about the importance of identifying LAB from tomato, banana, citrus, pumpkin and amaranthus? Which was the criterion for their choose? This clarification is crucial for the significance of the work. • In general, due to the different characteristics of LAB, different media are employed for their isolation. Using only MRS, some other LAB may be not revealed. E.g. M17 is commonly used for coccus-shaped LAB. The majority of works dealing with the isolation of LAB use at least MRS and M17 together. • Genetic information are of paramount importance in the process of characterization of a microbial population, but those data cannot say much about that population if their numbers (concentrations) is not known. The results of the counts have to be reported in this kind of papers. This point is mandatory for the acceptance of the work. Please provide the paper with a table showing the concentration of these bacteria . • In addition, the concentration of a given microbial group should be compared to the total microbial count, generally determined on PCA (plate count	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	agar). If the authors have also these data, they are strongly invited to show them. • The criterion for the selection of presumptive LAB to be analysed is obscure. In general, a phenotypic or better yet genotypic strain differentiation is somehow approached before the identification is performed. This is done to avoid the risk of identifying clones and not cover all different strains. How were the isolates selected before identification? Why were chosen 40 isolates?	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	• Abstract. As is it is not an abstract. Please reduce the length of about 70%. It is too detailed and is a repetition of the main text. The abstract lacks of the main objective of the study, as well as the applicability of data. • Units. Use “g” for grams, not “gm” (it does not exist in the international measure system!); “min” not “mins”; “h” not “hr”. Use LAB as acronym not lactic acid bacteria in the extended form. • ...”10 gm of in...” what does it mean? • L95. Why primers 518F and 800R were used? I suppose they have been employed in control reaction. Please clarify their role. • L100. Results should progressively show the finding of the work. How were the 105 isolates observed? How many from tomatoes? How many bananas? Ecc... • Figure 1. The results at this stage cannot show the name of the species found. Moreover, this figure is not necessary, please delete it from the text. • The same for figures 2 and 3. They do not show any difference among LAB or interesting data, thus there is no point in presenting 16S DNA bands. Please remove these three figures. This is a useless way to show these results. • Weissella confusa not Weissella confuse. • Use abbreviation of genera after the first citation. • Table 1 and table 2. The title should be shorter. E.g. “Identification of LAB from fruits and vegetables. Merge the two tables. • The results are too detailed and are a repetition of data reported in tables. • L269-273. No conclusions have been provided.	
---------------------------------------	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The present work dealt with the molecular characterization of lactic acid bacteria from fruits and vegetables. The work is interesting in principle, but the significance of the work is unclear. The main objective and the applicability of data is not properly showed. The methodology for the development of the work is appropriate, but lacks of some preliminary, fundamental results. The results are showed in a form that is too detailed and inappropriate for a scientific journal. The length of the manuscript is in accordance with the results shown but in some parts has to be shortened. The overall quality of the study is acceptable, but not sufficient in this form. Some major criticisms have to be addressed. Even though I'm not the best person to judge the English style, the manuscript seems to be clearly written and comprehensive. The study gives us additional information on the lactic acid bacterial ecology of fresh fruits and vegetables. The topic is of interest for British Microbiology Research Journal.	
---	---	--

Note: Anonymous Reviewer