

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_111426
Title of the Manuscript:	Gold Nitrate Nanoparticles: A Candidate for Nanobiotechnology Applications
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	  1. <b>Yes</b> , The significance of a manuscript titled "Gold Nitrate Nanoparticles: A Candidate for Nanobiotechnology Applications" would depend on the content of the research and the findings presented in the manuscript. The title suggests that the manuscript explores the potential applications of gold nitrate nanoparticles in the field of nanobiotechnology.  2. <b>Yes</b>  3. Abstract is comprehensive but not related to work and title. If possible change the abstract according to that.  4. <b>Yes</b>  5. Scientifically correct, but if possible, rewrite the methodology correctly refer some gold Nitrate preparation journals.  6. Reference is not sufficient 4 more reference is needed.	  We have added the number of references, namely the one that highlights the chemical part of gold nitrate. The abstract has been rewritten.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	  Yes. But next time check the manuscript in Grammarly once. The sentence formation is not correct in some the sections in the manuscript.	  We informed the editor that we were aware of the tool, which contributes to improving the writing of the text
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

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