

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_122814</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Biosynthesis and Characterization of Zinc Nanoparticles Using Pseudomonas and Actinobacteria</b>
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 3

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</b>	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	I like this manuscript because 1- ZnONPs have safe and non-toxic natural characteristics. 2- using this method of Biological ZnONPs synthesis, this strategy is a facile, rapid, cost-effective, non-toxic, and eco-friendly productive method because it is not very expensive, and it can also substitute toxic chemicals and decreases capping and stabilizing agents. 3- Their results were confirmed by the use of various analytical techniques.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, it is suitable	
<b>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.</b>	1- It is not necessary to explain where is research carried out 2- Add more information or important about the green synthesis of bioactive ZnO NPs	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes, they are.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this</b>	1- Use of various analytical techniques to admit their result 2- Use of diversity of microbes 3- Valuable results	

### Review Form 3

manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, it is not. 1-Please use more recent references. 2-add new references to the manuscript. 3-Recheck references	
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	This is good, but grammatical errors should be corrected, especially part of the material and methods that need grammatical review.	
Optional/General comments	Nothing	

### 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:	<b>Helal Nemat Farahzadi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National University of Skills, Iran</b>