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Reviewer's report:

Suprim Tha and his colleagues wrote this manuscript presenting the in silico search for new chemical agents with potential antimicrobial action with potential multiple mechanisms of action.

In general, the manuscript is well written and in my opinion complies with the general requirements in the field of scientific publication.

I would like to comment on this manuscript, as follows:

- words "background", "results" must be removed from the abstract section
- all bacterial names should be italicized over the whole paper

Molecular docking section:

- row 30: space should be added between 11 and Kcal
- row 37: after Ile103 . must be replaced with ,
- row 58: 2a,2b,2c must be written 2a, 2b, 2c

Drug target identification section:

- row 40: metK codes FOR? this word I think it is unnecessary
- name of drugs must not be capitalized (ex. Diketopiperazine, Bicyclomycin, etc)

Conclusion section:

- row 53: Indole must be written indole

Protein and ligand preparation:
-row 18-19: how have you used Kollman and Gasteiger charges? Is this possible?

About all tables: decimal numbers should have the same number of decimals on all tables

I would like to see some more severe filtering of values resulted from the molecular docking study. All energies are significant? Some of them could be removed?

Can you make a clustering analysis of the poses in order to have a better filtering of the results?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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