

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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	
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.	Your abstract is well-structured and presents the essential components: <b>background, methods, results, and conclusion</b> . However, there are a few areas where clarity, specificity, and completeness can be improved. Here are my suggestions for enhancement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Clarify how isolates were <b>selected for molecular identification</b></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Specify which <b>PCR target genes</b> were used for molecular identification</li> </ul>	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The introduction provides a strong rationale for the study, emphasizing <b>AMR, the need for new antibiotics, and soil bacteria as a potential source</b>.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The methodology follows a logical flow from <b>sample collection, bacterial isolation, identification, screening, and molecular characterization</b>.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The methods used (Gram staining, VITEK-2, perpendicular streak, checkerboard, and 16S rRNA sequencing) are appropriate and scientifically validated.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Some sections lack <b>specific details</b> (e.g., How many isolates were identified? How many were unidentified?).</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Certain <b>phrases need clarification</b> (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).</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Some <b>technical details</b> 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 <b>40 cycles of denaturation</b> at 95°C for 1 minute).</li> </ul>	
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.	

### Review Form 3

<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	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>actinomycetes</i> " vs. " <i>actinomyces</i> " should be used consistently. <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure uniform formatting for units, scientific names (italicized), and references.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>N/A</b>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Najwa A Mhmoud</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Khartoum, Sudan</b>