

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77799
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTI- DIABETIC AND CYTOTOXIC EFFECT OF ZINC OXIDE NANOPARTICLES SYNTHESISED USING <i>Boerhaavia diffusa</i>
Type of the Article	N/A

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	<p>Review comments</p> <p>In this article, the anonymous authors prepared the ZnO NPs using a Boerhaavia diffusa extract. The work is good but is very poorly written and explained. I would suggest revising the article so that to make it more visible to the wide researchers working in this area. I would oppose publishing this article at this level now. My recommendation is major revision. Hopefully, the authors would take the following suggestions and comments positively and would revise the text accordingly to improve the work in the revised version of the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The introduction is very simple and how just a few sentences will cover your research work. In the introduction section, the authors wrote about the use of NPs for the human being. It is suggested to write a little about the toxicity of NPs as well, as NPs have toxicity to the humans and environment as well i.e., Bioinorganic Chemistry and Applications, Volume 2017, Article ID 4101735, 12 pages, https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/4101735.2. In some places, the authors mentioned microliter while in other mL, it is suggested to uniformly mention the concentration in the whole text. Secondly, "ml" is written in the text, it is suggested to write "mL" in the script.3. The author's work is mainly focused on the cytotoxic activity of the ZnO NPs, but there is no literature about it in the introduction and in the text as well. It is suggested to cite some good work about cytotoxicity while explaining your results, i.e., Journal of Coordination Chemistry, 2014, 67, 20, 3414–3430, & Polyhedron 194 (2021) 114909.4. The authors mentioned in the text that "ZnO NPs have disinfectant properties". It seems that you go through the literature very superficially. It would be great to see the proper literature about antimicrobial or disinfectant surfaces. i.e., J. Mater. Chem. B, 2018, 6, 3782.5. The NPs have been synthesized by various methods i.e., Mater. Res. Express 7 (2020) 016506. How would the authors justify that their preparation methods for the synthesis of NPs are better than the other methods?6. The authors mentioned that ZnO NPs can be used for different purposes, without specifying their uses. It is suggested that the authors should write more about the uses of ZnO NPs in the introduction section i.e., Z. Phys. Chem. 2021; aop, https://doi.org/10.1515/zpch-2020-1778, to make the text very impressive for the readers.	
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?	It seems that the article is okay but need to revise it properly.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Syed Niaz Ali Shah
Department, University & Country	Tsinghua University, China