SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Microbiology Research Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_BMRJ_9670**
Title of the Manuscript:	**An improved protocol for metagenomic DNA from high humus, alkaline and saline soil of chinampa for T-RFLP fingerprinting analysis**
Type of the Article	**Original Research 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	**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	In the **Abstract section** correct the following positions: **Aim**: was to obtain – NOT was to obtained **Study design**: Remove the beginning of the sentence: "Soil samples were collected and" and start with "Different protocols…were tested (not test!) and modified…" **Conclusions** - pay an attention on the last sentence, it should be "with" not whith **Line 57** – in the context of the soil layer "30-60" it will be better to use the word "subsurface" instead of deep… **Line 72** – describe how the colony was counted? With use of an automatic colony counter? Or just by yourself? **Line 124** – give more details about DNA concentration measurement, like wavelength, type of UV-spectrophotometer, proportion of DNA and sterile water used for measurement. Please also add more discussion to the T-RFLP analysis in the Result and Discussion section. Are your results comparable with other studies? It means, ismentioned by you microbial phyla are generally common in similar soils, rich in humic substances?	
Minor REVISION comments	INTRODUCTION **Line 22** – it will be better "still remain unrecognized" **Line 24** – it will be better "through which" **Line 29** – it will be better to write [5-11] **Line 32** – please write [15-17]	

	Line 34 – it will be better to write "this kind of material" in order to avoid the repetition of "environmental samples" **Line 36, 129** – remove "(" **Line 47** – replace "in" by "about this soil" MATERIALS AND METHODS **Line 79** – write [7-11, 23, 24] RESULTS AND DISCUSSION **Line 148** – it will be better "are presented" **Line 151** – remove "in the chinampa soils" **Line 187** – please write [30-32] **Line 200 and next** – *Firmicutes, Actinobacteria, Proteobacteria* – should be written in italic style	
Optional/General comments	The subject of the paper is very interesting and important. What is more the paper will be helpful for many other researchers, having problems with contaminants, i.e. humic substances in the soil samples, resulting in difficulties with PCR reaction after DNA extraction procedure. I strongly recommend it to publication in BMRJ. However, minor revision is needed before publication.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Agnieszka Wolińska
Department, University & Country	Department of Biochemistry and Environmental Chemistry, The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland