



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_36459
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibacterial activity of actinomycetes isolated from waste dump soil in Western Uganda
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 A very good research work in a time like this.	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	Kindly adhere to the comment in your abstract Line 50: How were you able to achieve a measure of 3-15 cm depth with a spoon? Line 64: The media used you did not indicate if it's a selective media for only actinomycetes or can also allow the growth of other microorganisms? Line 78: Where those test organisms verified properly before use (screening)	It was clearly mentioned that "using a sterile stainless spoon with hand core and sterile gloves to avoid contamination". Which means not only spoon was used. Starch casein nitrate agar and Glycerol casein agar are selective media but yeast extract starch casein agar was not 100% selective The test organisms were verified to confirm before screening. However, the clinical resistant organisms were also rescreened to confirm their resistance profile. It was true that, many researchers used different solvents to extract bioactive compounds from actinomycetes but this study used only one solvent (ethanol) for extraction due to the universal polarity of the solvents as described by previous researchers.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 110: why did you decide to use only one solvent considering the fact that most researchers normally use two or more different types of solvent for extraction. Line: 155: this version of your statistical analysis is just too old. Recently we are talking of version 21 why did you choose to use that?	The reviewer should know that we used PAST software NOT SPSS software for analysing the data. The latest version of that software is (3.14 versions) as we stated in the manuscript text.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It's the Media use in this research formulated or readily available in the market? Why not rotary evaporator to dry the extract?	It was formulated, and pH was adjusted as recommended by previous studied. Rotary evaporator was reported by many researchers as well as used of Hot air oven and seems to give the same results.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In subsequent research work ,you can also consider clinical isolates if the metabolites produced by the actinomycetes swill be able to inhibit more than the bacterial typed cultures	In this study both standard and clinical Isolates were used. Check line 78 under test organisms section "Standard drug sensitive bacteria <i>Escherichia coli</i> ATCC25922, <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> ATCC27853, and <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> ATCC25923), drug (s) resistant clinical bacterial isolates (<i>Escherichia coli</i> 2966, <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> 2929, and <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> 2876)