

Reviewer Report

Title: A single mini-barcode test to screen for Australian mammalian predators from environmental samples

Version: Original Submission **Date:** 20 Mar 2017

Reviewer name: Andrea Galimberti

Reviewer Comments to Author:

The manuscript is well written and I found it useful in the field of conservation biology coupled with genetics approaches.

I have only minor points that authors should address:

- ROWS 111-114: Use "region" instead of "sequence" and the sentence is quite redundant and somewhat circular. I suggest to rephrase it.

- TABLE 1: It is unclear, which criteria were used to adopt the two threshold values. Maybe the authors can calculate a sort of optimum threshold due to minimum cumulative error rate (see Ferri et al. 2009 DOI: 10.1186/1742-9994-6-1 or Galimberti et al. 2012 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0040122>)

- ROWS 260-262: This is an important point. What contingency plan the authors propose to overcome this limit? It is unclear from the text.

I also think that the recent review by Galimberti and colleagues (DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4404/hystrix-26.1-11347>) concerning DNA barcoding on mammalian taxa should be cited.

Methods

Are the methods appropriate to the aims of the study, are they well described, and are necessary controls included? Yes

Conclusions

Are the conclusions adequately supported by the data shown? Yes

Reporting Standards

Does the manuscript adhere to the journal's guidelines on [minimum standards of reporting?](#) Yes

Statistics

Are you able to assess all statistics in the manuscript, including the appropriateness of statistical tests used? There are no statistics in the manuscript.

Quality of Written English

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript: Acceptable

Declaration of Competing Interests

Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

- Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
- Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
- Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
- Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
- Do you have any other financial competing interests?
- Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal

To further support our reviewers, we have joined with Publons, where you can gain additional credit to further highlight your hard work (see: <https://publons.com/journal/530/gigascience>). On publication of this paper, your review will be automatically added to Publons, you can then choose whether or not to claim your Publons credit. I understand this statement.

Yes