

-----Original Message-----

From: XXX YYY<xxx@yyy.zzz>

Sent: Fri, Nov 29, 2013 at 9:54 AM

To: Managing Editor

Subject: Re: Request for final decision for manuscript number 2013_BMRJ_6587

After reading the manuscript, I have the following observations:

1. In the title page, the author's name and affiliation should be presented.
2. The importance or necessity of this study should be clearly described in the introduction and in abstract.
3. In several cases, the methods were not described clearly or absent, such as:
 - 1) Lines 53-54, method for prepare the inoculants.
 - 2) Line 55, is the medium pure oil? Or a medium supplied with a certain concentration of oil was used?
 - 3) The measurement of growth rate of the strains was absent.
4. Lines 179-185, the authors discussed the unspecific amplification of 16S rRNA gene, but the photograph in figure 1 did not show multiple bands. The smear zone above the PCR band is very possible produced by the template DNA which was degraded.
5. In discussion, lines 228-231 repeated the lines 199-203; lines 231-234 repeated line 207-209; lines 236-238 repeated lines 212-214. I strongly suggest the authors to check their manuscript carefully to avoid this kind situation.
6. All the three figures were not important and do not give valuable information. So they can be deleted.
7. Reversion is needed for the references according to the requirement of the journal, such as using abbreviation for the journal names.

I also put many minor corrections in the text.

According to these observations, I have to ask the authors to make a major reversion, even adding the other strains for 16S rRNA gene sequencing.

Editor's Details:

En Tao Wang

Departamento de Microbiología, Escuela Nacional de Ciencias

Biológicas, Instituto Politécnico Nacional, México

And

State Key Laboratory of Agrobiotechnology and College of Biological

Sciences, China Agricultural University, Beijing, China (invited professor)

Note: Modification was done in this document ONLY to hide the email i