



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_6619
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro antagonistic potentials against fungal plant pathogens of soil actinomycetes species from the National Park “El Chico”, a protected forest in México
Type of the Article	Short Communication

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	The author has made good efforts on the aspect of actinomycetes isolation and fungi-antagonism. The data was reliable and meaningful. However, the anti-fungi bioactivity was not only attribute to compounds, but some bioingredients, such as chitinases. Lots of actinomycetes could produce these enzymes and exhibit excellent anti-fungi ability. Therefore, the author should do more experiments to verify the origin of the bioactivity of his 6 isolates, by compounds, by chitinases or both? I recommend the author: 1. Do the chitin degradation experiment; 2. Extract the fermentation agar with ethanol(1:2 v/v, it can deactivate the chitinase and extract most of the compounds at the same time) at least 8 hours, separate the extracts and agar residue with filter paper, remove the ethanol in vaccum and test the anti-fungi bioactivity of the ethanol concentrate propotion. If the strains do not degrade chitin, the author can conclude compounds were responsible for the bioactivity, otherwise, the author should carefully examine the origin of anti-fungi bioactivity. I have found there would be some problems about the fig 1. For example, according to the author, strain CACIA-2.22HGO is a streptomycete, however, the corresponding branch about the isolate could not be attributed to streptomyces in fig 1. and made the	Response to reviewer recommendations 1 and 2: 1. Evidence with images or data about the type of interactions is difficult to develop in 7-14 days, since some considerations must be done before doing an experiment: Activation of freeze spores requires subculture the preserved spores onto an agar media; this process needs at least 14 days to obtain a culture well-developed. After that, it is necessary a massive production of spores to be used for the experiments, which require 14 to 21 additional days. Considering that title was changed to: "Isolation of soil actinomycete species from a mesophyll mountain forest and their potential to antagonize fungal pathogens", in order to focus the objective to isolation and characterization, I believe that the present results with the improvements to the manuscript fit well to a Short communication. In relation with figure 1, the text related with this figure was modified and clarified.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	tree-structure confusing. The misidentification of the strains on the tree mostly owing to the too short sequences. Thus, I suggest the author do the 16S rDNA PCR/clone sequencing of the 6 isolates, obtain more longer(1200-1450 bps) sequences and reconstruct more reliable N-J tree.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Some spelling and grammar errors were marked in the modified *.pdf file.	Spelling and grammar errors were corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		