

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126395
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of Copper nanoparticles synthesized using the leaf extracts of Lawsonia inermis, Eucalyptus globulus, Psidium guajava, and Azadirachta indica
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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	Copper Nanoparticles are upcoming nanomaterials for various nanobiotechnological applications. CuNPs show high biocompatibility and provide various therapeutic effects. This manuscript is appropriate in showing its green synthesis methods.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is 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.	Yes, it is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it is appropriate	
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 synthesis and characterisation are supported well using UV-Vis spectroscopy, FESEM and FTIR which show positive results. Moreover, the synthesis methods are sound. The paper is robust enough, apart from a point mentioned ahead.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, they are sufficient.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Quality of the language is suitable.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The NPs can also be analysed using XRD to be clearer with the structural variation of the NPs. This will support the morphological data provided by FESEM.	

#### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	Mihir Iyer
Department, University & Country	Interdisciplinary School of Science And Savitribai Phule Pune University, India