

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123137
Title of the Manuscript:	Green Synthesis of Nanomaterials with Phytochemicals for Treating Multidrug Resistant Bacteria
Type of the Article	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.	This article highlights nanoparticle production from plants	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is good	
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.	Many points are missing in Abstract. Statistical value of MIC, Cell line study result.All are missing	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Sections are suitable for manuscript	
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.	There some unethical content seen in manuscript. The figure of SEM is not authentic. Need to check. Cell line assay also no proof shown.-	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Cell line assay references are not included. The work with latest references need to be added.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	More discussion need to be added. The SEM image scale and magnification value need to be included in image. Lot of disparity is seen in manuscript. I think the work is not done, image was take from other source, cell line assay also not conducted. Values are missing. Measurement of nanoparticle also missing in image attached.	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 3](#)

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:	Pinkie Cherian
Department, University & Country	ST Joseph's College for Women, India