

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78502
Title of the Manuscript:	Preparation of mouthwash using Ficus benghalensis assisted silver nanoparticles and a comparative analysis of its antimicrobial 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:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>In this study, a mouthwash has been prepared using <i>Ficus benghalensis</i>-mediated silver nanoparticles which was then assessed for its antimicrobial activity against a panel of common oral pathogens <i>in vitro</i>. The preparation elicited potent antimicrobial activity, supporting its potential usefulness as a mouthwash against oral pathogens.</p> <p>This manuscript has merit and may be considered for publication, but the authors must first correct, improve, and clarify the following aspects.</p> <p>The authors mention in the Abstract as well as the Materials and Methods that <i>Ficus benghalensis</i> has been used. Which part of the plant? Where collected? How processed? Fresh or dried?</p> <p>The authors also mention in the Abstract as well as the Materials and Methods <i>Ficus benghalensis</i>-mediated silver nanoparticles. What are these? <i>Ficus benghalensis</i> bound to silver nanoparticles? And again, which part(s) of <i>Ficus benghalensis</i>?</p> <p>The authors must provide a bit more information about <i>Ficus benghalensis</i> in the Introduction. For instance, "the banyan fig <i>Ficus benghalensis</i> L. in the Moraceae family, commonly known as the mulberry or fig family".</p> <p>The authors must also provide a sound rationale for evaluating <i>F. benghalensis</i> against oral pathogenic micro-organisms.</p> <p>The authors must also explain the advantages of <i>F. benghalensis</i>-AgNP-based mouthwashes when compared to conventional mouth washes with regards to health, costs, and toxic effects to the human body and the environment. And what are the toxic effects of Ag-derived waste products to the environment?</p> <p>The authors must mention how much of each ingredient was used when describing the preparation of the mouthwash in paragraph 2.4 of the Materials and Methods.</p> <p>In paragraph 2.5 of the Materials and Methods the authors mention that "Different concentrations of mouthwash were tested". Which concentrations, exactly? And they also mention "Different concentrations of nanoparticles (25 µl, 50 µl, and 100 µl). µl per what?"</p> <p>In paragraph 3.3. of the Results and Discussion the authors mention that a graph has been plotted (Figure 5). What against what? A graph illustrating what?</p> <p>The references must be adjusted according to the format of the journal.</p> <p>The authors would benefit from having a native English speaker reviewing the manuscript before (re)submitting it for consideration for publication.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Use either AgNP or Ag NP as an abbreviation for silver nanoparticles</p> <p>The authors mention in the Abstract as well as the Introduction: "Nanotechnology deals with particles which are less than 100 nm". 100 nm in diameter?</p> <p>The authors may consider combining paragraphs 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 of the Materials and Methods and think up a proper title.</p> <p>mM instead of milli molar.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	color instead of colour The authors may consider describing the Results and the Discussion in separate sections.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Dennis R.A. Mans
Department, University & Country	Anton de Kom University of Suriname, Suriname