

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_125422
Title of the Manuscript:	Annona stenophylla biosynthesised Zinc Oxide nanoparticles (ZnONPs), structural and activity characterisation
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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	Manuscript addresses some major concerns. Not only describes an effective synthesis strategy but also provides good applications for them. The characterisation part is lacking a bit but can be managed well by revision.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, it needs to be reframed for content clarity and precision	
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.	Since the authors have not performed diabetes studies, it need to be removed from abstract	
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.	In 1.4, replace 2 and 3 in dimensions by two and three. Why did the author prefer lyophilized extract in place of fresh extract.? Use italics for scientific names throughout the text. Since the authors have not performed FTIR analysis of nanoparticles, how can they be sure of the role of phenols for reduction and capping.? XRD analysis needs to be performed for crystal analysis. It is lacking here. Cite well acknowledged articles such as, Journal of King Saud University - Science. 30(2): 168-175. DOI: 10.1016/j.jksus.2016.10.002 and others	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Mentioned in comments	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Pragati Jamdagni
Department, University & Country	G. V. M. Girls College, India