



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_54599
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and characterization of antibiotic producing Actinomycetes from mud nest of wasps
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>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author did not mention number of experiments replicates in materials and methods Type & composition of the Actinomycete Agar medium was not mentioned by the author and using that agar medium preferred to have a reference. Weight of the nest material & volume of saline water used for isolation of the microorganisms or for making extract were not mentioned by the author Volume of the LB medium used for antimicrobial production assay was not mentioned by the author. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using the abbreviation LB before mention its full expression is not accepted. The author advised to correct that. Unnecessary phrase is found (e.g., for antibiotic) in the introduction line 6. In introduction line 13, correct beetle to beetle. In section 2.3, correct the spelling of sacker to shacker. 	
Optional/General comments	Correct the position and montage of the images and take care about minor mistyping.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kamal E. M. Elkahlout
Department, University & Country	Islamic University of Gaza, Palestine