



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJPR_7085
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of the Cultural parameters for Improved Production of Antimicrobial Metabolites by Streptomyces gulbargensis DAS 131T
Type of the 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors have mentioned in line no. 69 of the text that the strain has been deposited in the NCBI genbank – This is not possible, only the nucleotide sequences of the organism can be submitted in NCBI- Needs clarification for this claim. The said strain has not been deposited in any culture collection centre anywhere in the world if so do provide the accession number so that other scientific community can also access it. 2. Provide the medium components of ISP-2 in line no. 73 of the text 3. The composition of the production medium in line no. 75 should be provided in the text or as separate heading. 4. Heading 2.2 should be after heading 2.3 just interchange 5. The name of test pathogens written in line no. 84 to line no 86 does not tally with those written at line no. 130 to 138. Need to write all the test pathogens in one area in the text. Also provide the accession no. of <i>aspergillus niger</i>, <i>aspergillus flavus</i> and <i>penicillium citrinum</i> if they are collected from specific source, if not mention the source of origin/collection ??? this will provide standard of yr article. 6. Also mention the organism in full including strain no , similarly in line no. 126 of the text <i>S. gulbargensis</i> ?? always follow uniform pattern in scientific article. 7. No heading in line no. 130 8. The author has listed several test organisms in line no. 130 to 138 which are not included in the optimization study as reflected in the graphs in the figures, then what is the rationale of selecting few organisms in the graph. Overall the procedure of optimization from the beginning of the experimental design has serious flaw. There is no proper design. 9. The overall set up may be reoriented as stated. 10. Elaborate substantially the effect of incubation period with regard to growth 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

phase and production phase of organisms. This is a very important step in antimicrobial agent production. So give reason for yr finding and discuss yr finding by citing supporting references

11. Line no. 175, the text meaning is not understandable to readers , English composition is very poor throughout the text
12. Line no. 182 – no need for many unwanted citations. Restrict no of citations to minimum level.
13. Second sentence of section 3.4 is not understandable to the reader. English composition to be rectified.
14. In line no. 219- the use of the phrase as “antimicrobial activity production” may be change with some other word as the word “activity production” **sounds very vague**
15. Line 219 to 220- The author has highlighted the point ‘*the antimicrobial activity production seems to be no way correlated to the biomass yield (Fig. 5)*’ **This line is very much contradictory to the very purpose of the experimental set up since growth and production are always a related phenomenon in antimicrobial agent biosynthesis. An explanation may be needed.**
16. Section 3.4 – explain your finding giving reasons, why, how and then give supporting reference to your reasoning. Why higher concentration of carbon is not favouring antimicrobial agent production – the reason, what effect glucose has on antimicrobial agent synthesis should be explain. **(For this refer carbon/glucose catabolic repression and analyse your finding. For this the author may refer classical/standard articles on “cultural conditions for screening of new antibiotics” by Iwai and Omura also Refer Carbon source regulation of idiolite biosynthesis in actinomycetes by Demain.**
17. The author has shown the observation in Fig 5 and fig 6 with regard to biomass accumulation which looks very bizarre to any reader. In case of fig 6 when glucose (1%) is added the biomass is less than 200 mg while in Fig 5 when glucose (1%) is added the biomass is much more than 200 mg. How ?? . **This finding needs detail study and requires explanation.**
18. Fig 7 & Fig 8 – Soya peptone at 0.5% gives biomass nearly 300 mg in fig 7; then soya peptone at 0.5% gives biomass just around 250 mg in Fig 8. How so much variation?? **The deviation is very high from practical point of view. Needs explanation**
19. Section 3.5 – Only the effects of K_2HPO_4 **has been studied why not other**



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>salts?? What is the rationale behind has to written somewhere in the text.</p> <p>20. Line no. 301 to 308 – Specify the strain no. of the microorganisms as in line no. 130 to 138.</p> <p>21. Table 1- Give full name of organism upto strain level. eg. <i>S. Gulbargensis</i>??. write properly the heading giving the name of yr organism uniformly throughout the text as well as in the table</p> <p>22. Table 1- mention the strain no. for all the test pathogens in the table as in case of line no. 130 to 138, to maintain uniformity in the text and good article.</p> <p>23. Fig no. 10. Mention Strain no. for all the test pathogens.</p> <p>24. Very important point _ whenever you are using organism name always write Genus , species , strain in full for the first time in the text, and in subsequent lines or in tables or figures abbreviate the genus name , species in full followed by strain name or no. This is very important in microbiological work.</p> <p>25. The first sentence of the conclusion is a universally known fact. The conclusion is not much convincing to make a new idea or finding to readers. Need further improvement.</p> <p>26. Discussion - Explain the detail findings of your results give reason for the findings and discuss the finding neatly with reason by giving suitable citations.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Over all the experimental set up is not properly design, requires re orientation. The English is very poor. The authors may allow some senior authors to read and rectify all the mistakes pointed out so that it can be presentable to readers.</p> <p>2. Prefer to see the rectified version of the manuscript</p>	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer