

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_118205
Title of the Manuscript:	Green synthesis of silver nanoparticles against cell wall anchoring proteins in Streptococcus mutans.
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This paper will support existing literature and vice versa. Manuscript speaks about supremacy of silver nanoparticles over antibacterial (didn't mentioned directly of title) property.</p> <p>2. Think of some other title for example : A. Green synthesis of silver nanoparticles using <i>Eupatorium odoratum</i> against cell- wall anchored proteins (CWAPs) of Streptococcus mutans – gram positive bacteria responsible for dental disorders in humans. B. Antibacterial activity/ property of Green synthesis of silver nanoparticles using <i>Eupatorium odoratum</i> against cell- wall anchored proteins (CWAPs) of Streptococcus mutans.</p> <p>3. Abstract is comprehensive, but the aim, objectives, methodology and conclusions are not up to the expectation. Prepare an abstract, which gives an overall idea and insight to the readers.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are seems appropriate.</p> <p>5. Within the scope of this article, it is scientifically correct and acceptable, but similar and advanced studies are already published and available.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? 6. a. References are not from recent studies, provided article includes 1987, '92, '93 etc. 6. b. Recent references are advised, better after 2010 or 2015. 6. c. References are insufficient. More references are needed.</p> <p>Additional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Discussion part should be strong, more focused and bring recent advancement. ➤ Provide details/ evidences ➤ Authenticity of plant specimens. ➤ Purchase details of Silver nitrate ➤ Procurement details of Streptococcus Mutans. ➤ Details of Laboratory where all scientific steps are conducted. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language wise this manuscript is good. But high-quality language is recommendable for readiness of a research paper. Author can refine the language in areas of results, discussion and conclusions. Novel words can included to raise the standard of manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Focus on Title, discussions, conclusions and abstract.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arun R Nair
Department, University & Country	Vinayaka Mission's Homoeopathic Medical College, Vinayaka Mission's Research Foundation Deemed to be University, India