

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_84879
Title of the Manuscript:	Application of chemically and physically synthesized metal nanoparticles to Staphylococcus aureus
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Abstract 1. The abstract is too scanty since there is a lot of ongoing researches on nanoparticles. 2. It should contain more information on the use nanoparticles and the response of Staphylococcus aureus to them. 3. Mention other methods of synthesis of nanoparticles and why the emphasis on the chemically and physically produced ones. 4. The abstract should end with a conclusion emphasising the positive or negative effects of the nanoparticles on S.aureus. Conclusion 1. The conclusion should reflect the result of the objective. 2. It should reflect the title. 3. The conclusion ought to conclude on the response of S.aureus to the synthesized nanoparticles. 4. The second paragraph of the conclusion should be removed and taken to the body of the text under a created subheading 'limitations of Nanoparticles'. 5. References should not be cited in conclusion.	Correction done Amended revision Done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Check for typographical and grammatical errors. 2. Authors should refer to Authors Guide and conform to the standards of the journal. 3. Choi and coworkers can be more scientifically written as Choi et al..	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	