

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_115082
Title of the Manuscript:	Synthesis and Characterization of 6-Gingerol Gold Nanoparticle (Au-6G-NPs) Conjugates for Improving Bioavailability
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

## Review Form 1.7

## 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		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	It's normal	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	Manuscript has been revised
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes but needs revision	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes	
<b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b>		
	I am happy to review this article entitled ("Synthesis and Characterization of 6-Gingerol Gold Nanoparticle (Au-6G-NPs) Conjugates for Improving Bioavailability") Introduction: 1. The abstract should be in paragraph form, not in heading form. The abstract of the article looks like an essay.  2. Nanoparticles have advantages, but also limitations. Their potential toxicity, stability issues, and regulatory hurdles are challenges that need to be addressed. It is important to acknowledge these risks when discussing their benefits.  3. Metallic nanoparticles are tiny particles made of metals like gold or silver that can transport drugs or other therapeutic agents to specific areas of the body. Understanding these concepts is important for the development of new and effective treatments for various diseases. So, the authors should provide a brief explanation for understanding.  4. The author should consider gold nanoparticles' toxicity concerns and their impact on potential biomedical applications when discussing their synthesis methods.  5. The author should discuss the pros and cons of using nanoparticles.  Full Manuscript: 6. The author should check the spacing between words, units, figures, and paragraphs for example  7. Page 8: conjugate peak shifted to280 nm due ( no spacing between to and 280)  Page 8: right side 3436cm <sup>-1</sup> for 6-Gingerol and 1636cm <sup>-1</sup> formation (3436 and cm <sup>-1</sup> ) Page 9: which was found to be -4.06mV. (-4.06 and mV) Figure 9  8. There are a lot of mistakes due to spacing.  Results: 9. In the UV spectrum, the author claims about the formation or confirmation of material but	Complied, Revised the abstract  Complied, Added required contents  Complied  Complied  Complied  Complied  Complied  Complied  Complied  Complied  Complied, Added the reference and formulism

Review Form 1.7

	<p>he didn't add any reference. Furthermore, he didn't talk about formulism why these peaks appeared at these points, and which type of transitions occurred behind the peaks.</p> <p>10. In FTIR, the same is repeated. There is no literature available for the confirmation of material and no evidence is provided.</p> <p>11. Figures quality are not good many bars are not readable. The author should attach high-resolution figures.</p> <p>12. The author should provide a brief explanation about the result like in Figure 3a HR-TEM, The AuNPs were also characterized for dynamic light scattering (DLS) and zeta potential. But no explanation is described about what is happening in Figure 3a or others.</p> <p>Full Manuscript:</p> <p>13. The English and grammar mistakes should be checked.</p>	<p>Complied, Added the reference</p> <p>Complied, Added high resolution figures</p> <p>Complied</p> <p>Checked and complied</p>
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, it needs correction.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	