



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_BMRJ_14627
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Antibiotic Biosynthetic Potential of Actinomycetes Isolates to Produce Novel Antimicrobial Agents
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1- Line 57: Which Gram-negative and Gram-positive bacteria were screened by using perpendicular streak method? 2- Figure 3: Why in most of the lanes, there are two bands? There is no explanation for this in the manuscript. 3- Figures1-3: It's better to use one figure instead of these three. 4- Line 148-9: The authors mentioned: Of all the 341 actinomycete isolates screened, <u>26% (46)</u> were positive for the presence of the NRPS pathway. The underlined percentage or number is incorrect!	1. This part was published in another journal and the reference has been cited. 2. Figure 3 showed unspecific band at lane 3 and lane 5 and lane 11, which indicate that the PCR conditions are not optimum for this primer to be amplified a specific band. The expected fragment size was excise and purified before sequencing. 3. The each figure is for a different primer. 4. The percentage had been recalculated and corrected
Minor REVISION comments	1- Line 21: PKS and NRPS stands for polyketide synthases and nonribosomal peptide synthetases (NRPS), respectively. 2- Line 43: asamycins is incorrect. Ansamycins is correct. 3- Line 64: Abbreviation CTAB must be written in full name. 4- Line 75: what does "IDT" mean? It must be clarified in the manuscript. 5- Line 99: Basic Alignment Search Tool (BLAST) is not correct: Basic Local Alignment Search Tool is correct.	The correct changes has been applied in this section and highlighted yellow in the manuscript
Optional/General comments	-	