

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 advantages of green synthesis of nanoparticles from the plant extracts have been discussed and the difference between the morphology of the NPs have been reported in this article. Spectroscopic studies have been used to study the characteristics of NPs.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	This article may be referred as one of the articles which highlighted the advantages of green methods over the chemical methods of NPs synthesis. The conclusion part can be more elaborate to explain the findings. If the scope for the future research presented in it and it may add value to the article.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Few more references can be added to support the findings of this work.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good	
Optional/General comments	Nil	

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:	N. Sampathkumar
Department, University & Country	SSM College of Arts and Science (C-68064), India