

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: JNHM-107

**Title:** The Role of PonA Genes in Bacterial Pathogenicity and Antimicrobial Resistance: A Narrative Review

**Recommendation:**

- Accept as it is .....
- ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
- Accept after major revision .....
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

### *Detailed Reviewer's Report*

**Strength of the study:**

- The review addresses a highly relevant topic in antimicrobial resistance research
- Provides a comprehensive overview of PonA genes and their biological functions
- Includes evidence from multiple bacterial species and resistance mechanisms
- Literature is supported by appropriate scientific references
- The manuscript links molecular mechanisms with clinical implications
- Discussion on emerging resistance pathways is informative
- The conclusion aligns well with the evidence presented

**Weakness of the study:**

- The manuscript contains numerous grammatical and language errors
- Several sentences are poorly structured and difficult to understand
- The review lacks a detailed methodology for literature selection
- No description of ethical considerations for the review process is provided
- Some sections are repetitive and could be condensed
- Critical appraisal of included studies is limited
- Figures and summary tables could be expanded for better clarity

**Reviewers Comments:**

This narrative review discusses the role of PonA genes in bacterial pathogenicity and antimicrobial resistance, an area of considerable importance in the current era of increasing antimicrobial resistance. The manuscript provides a useful summary of the structure, function, and resistance-associated mutations of PonA proteins across different bacterial species. The topic is scientifically relevant and supported by a substantial number of references. However, the overall quality of writing requires significant improvement. Numerous grammatical mistakes, typographical errors, and awkward sentence constructions reduce readability and affect the scientific presentation. The methodology for selecting and evaluating the literature should be described more clearly to strengthen the credibility of the review. Although ethical clearance is generally not required for narrative reviews, a statement regarding ethical considerations and conflicts of interest would improve transparency. The review is informative and potentially valuable, but language revision and better organization are necessary before publication.

**Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:**

Based on the submitted manuscript, there is no clear evidence that the article has been previously published. The content appears to be presented as an original narrative review. No obvious signs of direct plagiarism were identified during review. However, a formal plagiarism and similarity assessment using standard journal screening software is recommended before acceptance and publication.