

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77949
Title of the Manuscript:	Green Synthesis and Antimicrobial Activity of Silver Nanoparticles Synthesised Using Terminalia chebula
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>)

### **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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-PI add SEM images to account for the particle and morphologies. Read the draft carefully so the running typos, grammatical errors and badly constructed sentences may pl be omitted.</li><li>- the UV-Vis spectrum has taken directly from the machine and presents poor resolution. PI plot the data to make it visible for the readers.</li><li>-The heading should to be numbered</li><li>- There is a small peak around 325 nm, the authors should comment on this.</li><li>-in figure 6 captions and titles are s missing</li><li>- tables captions and titles?</li><li>- Conclusion must to revise to clearly summarise the findings.</li></ul>	<p>Due to some technical issue, SEM image cannot be included in the manuscript. And the grammatical errors has been changed.</p> <p>As per reviewer comment, the UV Visible spectra data has been plotted.</p> <p>The headings were numbered accordingly.</p> <p>As per reviewer suggestion, it has been changed.</p> <p>Figure 6 captions were changed.</p> <p>As per reviewer suggestion, table captions and titles were given.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract need a clear and precise revision to reflect what has done in the study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- what is different in this study from previous reported research.</li></ul> <p>REFERNCES ARE NOT WELL FORMATED</p>	<p>As per reviewer suggestion, abstract has been changed and references were well formatted.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Title could be change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Introduction could be revised to make it coherent with the proposed study</li></ul> <p>TABLES CAN BE PRESENTED IN GOOD FORMTE</p>	<p>As per reviewer comment, title has been changed and table format was corrected.</p>

### **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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	