



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	2014_ARRB_14978
Title of the Manuscript:	Methane Cycling Microbial Communities in Natural and Drained Sites of Taldom Peatland, Moscow Region, Russia
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The paper presents a relevant subject for scientific community. Clearly written, organized and concise.	We would like to thank to the reviewer for the deep and thorough considering our manuscript and accepting it for publication after minor revision. We have revised our paper in accordance with reviewer's useful suggestions and comments.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Fig. 1: necessary to put the scale of the map and of the picture.</p> <p>The author presents the objectives and hypothesis of the paper in the Results and Discussion. I recommend that such issues are addressed at the end of item introduction.</p> <p>167 and 170 lines. The author explain how tested his hypothesis. I Recommend that this explanation is placed in the Material and Methods.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for the important criticism. We have added the scale bar to the picture of study site. At the same time, we believe that it is not necessary to apply scale at contour Russia map, visually demonstrated the approximate position of the research area.</p> <p>Thank you for this excellent point. In the revised version, the objectives and hypothesis are shifted to the end of Introduction.</p> <p>Thank you for the valuable advice. It seems to us that text item at 167-170 lines is rather description of our hypothesis than explanation of the testing way. So we have placed the text to the end of Introduction item.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please clarify the ethical issue, if any	There are no any ethical issues and risks that arise in our research, our study is not against the public interest, or that the release of information is allowed by legislation. It was not necessary to get ethical approval from Institutional or State or National or International Committee.