

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_130771
Title of the Manuscript:	Hunting for New Antibiotics from the Soil Bacteria of Tabuk Natural Reserves
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Is clear and conveys the main idea of the study	Thanks for the comments
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>Your abstract is well-structured and presents the essential components: background, methods, results, and conclusion. However, there are a few areas where clarity, specificity, and completeness can be improved. Here are my suggestions for enhancement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Clarify how isolates were selected for molecular identificationSpecify which PCR target genes were used for molecular identification	<p>Thank you for the suggestion. This is written in the abstract and highlighted in yellow.</p> <p>The identification of Actinomyces was confirmed or refuted molecularly by detecting the 16sRNA band in all the samples that were examined for their capacity to create inhibitory compounds.</p>
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The introduction provides a strong rationale for the study, emphasizing AMR, the need for new antibiotics, and soil bacteria as a potential source.The methodology follows a logical flow from sample collection, bacterial isolation, identification, screening, and molecular characterization.The methods used (Gram staining, VITEK-2, perpendicular streak, checkerboard, and 16S rRNA sequencing) are appropriate and scientifically validated.Some sections lack specific details (e.g., How many isolates were identified? How many were unidentified?).Certain phrases need clarification (e.g., "nearly every type of resistance gene can be found in different parts of the country"—this needs supporting evidence or revision for accuracy).Some technical details need refinement (e.g., "PCR protocol included initial denaturation at 95C for 10 minutes followed by 40X denaturation at 95C for 1 minutes": this should be written as 40 cycles of denaturation at 95°C for 1 minute).	<p>This is amended in the result section: A number of 14 isolates were found in the soil samples. Eleven were considered for further analysis and they are highlighted in green</p> <p>This "And nearly every type of resistance gene can be found in different parts of the country" is changed to this "Moreover, diverse antibiotic resistance genes are prevalent across multiple geographical regions within the nation"</p> <p>Suggested sentence was used and highlighted in the manuscript</p>
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some references (e.g., [1], [2], [6], [8], [10], [16]) only list "/pmc/articles/PMC..." instead of full URLs. Ensure full citations are provided.	References unified

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Your article is well-structured and contains valuable scientific content, but the English language quality can be improved to align with scholarly communication standards. <input type="checkbox"/> Terms like " <i>actinomyces</i> " vs. " <i>actinomyces</i> " should be used consistently. <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure uniform formatting for units, scientific names (italicized), and references.	Terms are now unified. Done and revised.
Optional/General comments	N/A	

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)	