

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126241
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of Zinc Nanoparticles Synthesized Using the Mushroom, Pleurotus sajor-caju
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It shows the potential of using a sustainable, eco-friendly method for synthesizing zinc nanoparticles through the use of a natural, biological source Characterizing these biosynthesized zinc nanoparticles is crucial for understanding their properties and potential applications in various fields. It contributes to the development of innovative, greener approaches in nanotechnology.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
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.	It needs modification.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Good	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study contributes to the advancement of scientific knowledge in the field of nanotechnology. It implies the use of advanced analytical techniques and methodologies for the characterization of these nanoparticles. It investigates a novel, eco-friendly approach to nanoparticle synthesis.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Not sufficient but the author used recent references.	
Minor REVISION comments	Good.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The abstract need modification it should be attractive and some contents of abstracts are missed ✓ It better if the design of the research is described ✓ It will be more attractive if some pictures added such as produced spawn and cultivated mushroom ✓ Conclusion also need modification. ✓ Try to acknowledge/ add citation in introduction. 	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Girma Waktola Gemechu
Department, University & Country	Wollega University, Ethiopia