



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJPR_7085
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Optimization of the Cultural parameters for Improved Production of Antimicrobial Metabolites by Streptomyces gulbargensis DAS 131T</b>
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript contains data about the optimization of the growth conditions of a Streptomycin strain. Many parameters have been considered to optimize growth conditions but I think that the manuscript does not contain a direct pharmacological relevance.</p> <p>The production of metabolites, that should be the focus of the manuscript taken into account the scope of the journal, is directly related to the biomass growth and metabolites are not measured in a direct way. The parameter that is optimized is biomass production rather than metabolite production that according to the figures presented in the manuscript seems a direct consequence.</p> <p>What metabolites are produced by the strain? Are they known or new molecules? At least one metabolite should be extracted and characterized.</p> <p>The nitrogen sources used in Figure 7 are or amino acids or mixtures usually adopted for rich culture media. It is therefore difficult to consider the effect of these last only as nitrogen sources.</p> <p>Furthermore, the discussion does not compare the results presented with other works present in the literature in terms of yields of biomass for example. For these reasons, I recommend the revision of the manuscript with the inclusion of at least one metabolite characterization.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	There are some errors within the manuscript that can be corrected by a careful revision.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Note: Anonymous Reviewer**