

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_124756
Title of the Manuscript:	Cannabis Sativa mediated copper doped Zinc Oxide nanoparticles (Cu <sub>2</sub> O-ZnONPs), characterisation and biomedical activity assessment
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> 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.	In this manuscript the authors have demonstrated how the synthesis of copper-doped zinc oxide nanoparticles (Cu <sub>2</sub> O-ZnONPs) can be mediated by polyphenolic extracts of the wild plant <i>Cannabis sativa</i> . The synthesised Cu <sub>2</sub> O-ZnONPs were rigorously tested for their anti-inflammatory, antioxidant and antibacterial properties. The manuscript would be of interest to the scientific community across various disciplines, not least on the globally important theme of antimicrobial resistance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The given title of the article is suitable, but I suggest expanding it to " <i>Cannabis sativa</i> -mediated synthesis of copper-doped zinc oxide nanoparticles (Cu <sub>2</sub> O-ZnONPs), characterisation and biomedical activity assessment"	
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.	The abstract of the article is suitable and comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are 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 manuscript does appear to be scientifically robust and technically sound. The methods used have been comprehensively described and appropriate controls appear to have been conducted.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The given references are sufficient and recent, but many of the citations in the reference list need to be formatted correctly and in a consistent manner. Please see the attached manuscript.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article is generally good it and would be suitable for scholarly communications after undergoing some minor corrections and changes. Please see the attached manuscript.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Suggested minor changes to the text and reference list have been made in the attached manuscript where places of changes are highlighted in yellow.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Simon G. Patching</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Biomedical Sciences, University of Leeds, United Kingdom</b>