

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77726
Title of the Manuscript:	GREEN SYNTHESIS OF COPPER NANOPARTICLES USING GINGER OLEORESIN AND ITS ANTICANCER ACTIVITY AGAINST LIVER CANCER CELL LINE
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title is not clear, misunderstanding and confusing even though this is a very good work. It is hard for readers to get the point whether the article focuses on synthesis, nanomaterials or natural products as well as to get which has anticancer activity nanomaterials or ginger alone or the mixture. Why is the need for synthesis? All of these makes it very hard to move through the manuscript. These therefore affect the abstract introduction but it turns out to be not clear either so it is much more confusing. 2. The contradiction is clear when compare Page 1 Line 15 (showing copper nanoparticles has the activity) and Line 22 (showing ginger has the activity). 3. Page 1. Line 6 should read “..for applications to a wide range of commercial...” 4. Page 1. Line 6-8 need to be rewritten because it is not understandable. What's the point of raising ginger here and its preparation? 5. Page 1. Line 20 should read “RESULTS:” 6. Page 2. Line 5 should read “Chemotherapy is widely used for the...” 7. Page 2. Line 7 should read “...cancer. Conventional methods with a mixture of controlled released technology and targeted drug delivery is simpler and..” 8. Page 2. Line 9 should read “..harmful. Furthermore, nanomaterials..” 9. Page 2. Line 11 should read “...concentration, and evasion...” 10. Page 2. Line 19 should read “...are not...” 11. Page 2. Line 24 should read “...contains a number of volatile oils in a..” 12. Page 3. Line 3 should read “...were conducted on...” 13. Page 3. Line 5 should read “...(11). In vitro...” 14. Page 3. Line 7 should read “...(13), cytotoxic..” 15. Page 3. Line 9 should read “...has translated into..” 16. Page 3. Line 21 should read “20 mM CuSO₄ was...” 17. Page 3. Line 23 should read “..photographed. The solution...” 18. Page 4. Line 28 should read “...DMSO-treated control.” 19. Page 5. Line 6. What is SE? 20. Page 5. Line 9 should read “RESULTS:” 21. Page 5. Line 15 and 21 should read (Figure 3) and (Figure 4). 22. Page 5 Lat line should read “..mediated copper..” 23. Page 8. Line 8 should read “..our study and found that..” 24. Page 8. Line 13 should read “..should be conducted with..” 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Pipat Chooto
Department, University & Country	Prince of Songkla University, Thailand