

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>

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.	The fact this manuscript addresses a new idea of research made it a very great work I will suggest for publication after corrections are affected. It provides an insight for the use of biomolecules on large scale from a natural source which can help to beat down cost of commercial products.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is very suitable, but I will suggest a rephrase	
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.	-Ensure you separate units from numbers - the abstract lacks conclusive section. The results part needs to be re-written as it doesn't sound scientifically. It should be reported in passive tense.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction: 1. Please separate units from numbers and do this throughout the manuscript. 2. The first-three sentences need to be cited. Please cite the first paragraph where needed. 3. "A study conducted by Musa <i>et al.</i> [12] using" please maintain one style of intext citation. Rather say A study conducted by [12] - Material and methods: 1. Please include the month to 2023-24. 2. Are the second and third paragraph a new method designed by you? If no, please indicate the source by citing the source. 3. Write Fig. in full as in Figure 1. - Results and discussion: 1. Please put the wavelength unit in figure 3. 2. "Field Emission Scanning Electron Microscopy" if you show full meaning in the context at first, the rest can be written in short form. 3. Figure 5 is not clear, please increase resolution for better view. - Conclusion: This part is not convinced enough. Please re-write and let it be comprehensive. 	
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 terms used in this manuscript is within its discipline. In addition, this research will be useful to healthcare provider as it created questions for research to further research on what is not covered in the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes, the references are recent but there are some parts in the Introduction and methods that needs to be cited.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable but needs to be polished.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- I will suggest the authors should include MS and elemental analysis to account for the weight of the synthesized compounds and also to know how much of each element are present.- In addition, this is a great research work	

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:	Sakariyau A. Waheed
Department, University & Country	Old Dominion University, United States of America