



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_BMRJ_15275
Title of the Manuscript:	Potentiality of Marine Streptomyces sp. AIAH-10 against Ciprofloxacin and Azithromycin Induced Resistant Escherichia coli
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. The title is not comprehensible. Should be rephrased to read 'Antibacterial Potential Of Ethyl-Acetate Extracts Of Marine <i>Streptomyces spp.</i> AIAH-10 To Drug Resistant <i>Escherichia coli</i> 2. Species should be abbreviated as spp. and not sp. 3. <u>Abstract</u>: The language is poor and full of grammatical errors. Abstract must be rewritten to correct these language deficiencies. For instance, 'Rapid emergence drug resistance...' should rather be 'The rapid increase in resistance among bacterial...' 4. <u>Introduction</u>: Authors must rewrite the introduction due to poor and incomprehensible English. 5. <u>The Method</u>: State the sources of the isolation media in Lines 57-58 and 107-109. Define ISP in line 72. Stick to one term, Actinomycetes or Streptomyces, but don't use them interchangeably. In line 90, put year of reference in bracket: Umasankar (2010). Line 91: What is MN broth? Define MN upon first use. Line 107-111: What concentration/McFarland's standard of <i>E. coli</i> suspension was used? Was	I agree with reviewer's comment and rephrased the title into 'Antibacterial Potential Of Ethyl-Acetate Extracts Of Marine <i>Streptomyces spp.</i> AIAH-10 To Drug Resistant <i>Escherichia coli</i>. Authors are agree to the reviewer's comment and all the suggestions are tried to do in the manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	CLSI/EUCAST guidelines used in the disc diffusion method? Please state. If EUCAST/CLSI guidelines were not used, then where did the author obtain the susceptible and/or resistant breakpoint from? 6. <u>Discussion:</u> Rewrite discussion without restating the methods and/or reviewing literature. Go straight to the analysis of the results, comparing and contrasting your findings with other studies. Hence, lines 198-209 must be deleted. 7. <u>Results:</u> Line 149 should read 'A total' and not 'Total'. Lines 171-172 and 176-178: The statements are evasive. They must be revised to clearly state which isolate/antibiotic/extract had 12mm, 15mm and 24mm. 8. <u>Conclusion:</u> Delete lines 218-220 and begin this section with 'This study demonstrates...' The conclusion should only summarise the studies' findings; nothing else.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<u>Methods:</u> 118: 'The plates were prepared at 4°C for 4 hours'. This statement is not clear and must be revised. Does it mean the whole work, between lines 114-119, was done under a temperature of 4°C? Line 124: Statement not clear. Did you use 3 tubes or that saline was the growth medium used for determining the MICs? What medium was in each tube? Clearly state these in line 122-126.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The experimental design, method and results are generally sound and scientifically good. However, the manuscript is poorly written and need massive grammatical improvement. The authors are advised to seek the help of a scientific writer to help with the language deficiencies.	Possible grammatical changes are done in the manuscript.