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	**Typographical errors are found all over the manuscript** **Novelty of work is lacking** **Sentences have to reframed with good English usage**	
Minor REVISION comments	Title: Actinomycete isolates and not actinomycetes Aims: Its only aim Methodology: non –ribosomal instead of nonribosomal Phylogenetic analysis instead of analyses Section 3.2 line no. 126 – indicate as *spp*. After the genus name if the species is unknown. Fig. should be indicated in bold format. Line 274 -rewrite the sentence Line 298- rewrite the sentence with good grammar	
Optional/General comments	NA	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**India**