

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77778
Title of the Manuscript:	GREEN SYNTHESIS OF ZINC OXIDE NPS USING BOERHAVIA DIFFUSA AND ITS ANTICARIOGENIC ACTIVITY
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1-The authors reported result of the anticariogenic activity of nanoparticles that they obtained. However there is something missing or wrong in their preparation process (reaction between "boerhavia diffusa solution" and "boerhavia diffusa in a solid form"?)</p> <p>2-The study of anticariogenic activity of boerhavia difusa is not new. the novelty was supposed be the utilization of zinc or zinc oxide linked to zinc or zinc oxide linked to boerhavia diffusa. But authors didn't paid enough attention to make it explicit.</p> <p>3-The authors showed no work concerning the synthesis of ZnO nanoparticles or the using of zinc metal, or oxide or ions.</p> <p>4- Certainly there is something missing in the preparation of sample on which authors have not paid attention.</p> <p>5- In abstract, "RESULTS AND DISCUSSION" are identical to "CONCLUSION"</p> <p>6-INTRODUCTION:          6.1 first sentence: "21<sup>st</sup>" and not "21 st"          6.2 Last sentence of the first paragraph: the sentence have no sense, like if there is something missing.          There is a of lack of coherence between the different sentence of the first paragraph          6.3 The English level must be improved in paragraph 2 and 3 of the introduction.          6.4 In the first sentence of the fourth paragraph, the syntax is not correct.          6.5 There is a lack of coherence from the 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence and 4<sup>th</sup> sentence.reference 24, 25 and 26 do not correspond to what authors said.</p> <p>7-MATERIALS AND METHOD:          There is something missing in this part which make everything incomprehensible.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>-The manuscript was not proofread before submission. There is a lack of coherence between sentences in the INTRODUCTION.</p> <p>-The English level in the manuscript is not constant. It is time to time very good and time to time very low.</p> <p>They authors should:</p> <p>-Corrected the paragraph on the preparation procedure of their nanoparticles</p> <p>-Proof that they synthesized zinc oxide nanoparticles (XRD)</p> <p>- Showed that boerhavia diffusa is link to the obtained nanoparticles (IR aanlysis) with zinc (EDX analysis or xps or ICP)</p> <p>-revised their manuscript before submission</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**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>Cedrik Ngnintedem Yonti</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Yaoundé I, Cameroon And Catholic University of Louvain, Belgium</b>