SDI Review Form 1.6

.

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CJAST_46052**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Green synthesis of metallic nanoparticles using leaf extract of Calotropis spp and their applications: A Review.**
Type of the Article	**Review Paper**

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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI 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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**In the title, the authors refer to metallic nanoparticles, however the paper mainly describes the synthesis of metal oxide nanoparticles (ZnO, TiO2, CuO…). The title does not reflect the content and should be amended.** **- Page 3, in the description of Calotropis spp, the authors should describe and mention the 2 variety here (i.e. procera and gigantean) otherwise the manuscript is confusing.** **- Page 3-4, the part 2.0 Characterization of the nanoparticles should be removed with all corresponding references because it is a review paper. This part is only need in the case of a scientific report to describe the equipment the research team used in this specific study. The interest of this part is very low, most of the readers are aware of the characterization methods.** **- Page 4-5, the part 3.0 should be shortened, the interest is low. The authors should emphases on the different method used for the synthesis of nanoparticles using calotropis spp (UV light, autoclaves, RT or high temperature…) and what are the effect of these methods on the growth (shape, size…).** **- The table should contain the size of the nanoparticles synthesized and the size distribution (column 3). This is an important parameter, it is know that biological methods (bacteria, fungi, plant extracts) induce a large size distribution (P. Rauwel et al., Advances in Materials Science and Engineering_Hindawi, Article ID 682749, (2015), DOI:10.1155/2015/624394).** **- Fig. 2 is a bit simple, the plant extract is usually already attached during the condensation step before the agglomeration of the nanoparticles themselves.** **- The table should be modified and procera should not be mixed with gigantean, for each type of nanoparticles, the 2 different plant extract should be 2 parts. We can see if there is a difference or not. In addition, if the method are different (see comment above), this should be indicated in the table.** **- In the discussion all synthesis are mixed, the authors should differentiate the different types of nanoparticles (Ag, Au, ZnO, CuO, FeO), otherwise the discussion is confusing.**	Please refer to pages 5 to 7 where the synthesis of Ag and Au nanoparticles were described without forming the oxide forms. Amended Part 2.0 has been removed as per reviewers' comment. Part 3.0 the relevant methods suggested have been added. Where the size distribution is missing was due to the fact that the consulted literatures didn't provide such information. The table has been amended as suggested. Amended as suggested.
Minor REVISION comments	- The English needs to be improved. The manuscript should be carefully read by a person proficient in English; there are numerous typos and grammatical errors that should be corrected. - The reference should contains only the main author's name (second name is added to avoid possible confusion, but this is not the case here). - The authors should have a look at the recent book chapter "Plant extract mediated synthesis of nanoparticles" by Küünal et al. (https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-51254-1.00014-2), it contains multiple relevant references. - What do the authors mean by metallic nanoparticles are the most flexible of the nanoparticles? - Page 10, the authors mention 2 times E.coli in the list.	The errors have been checked and corrected. The portion have been rewritten Amended.
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is very interesting and fits with the scopes of Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology. However, the manuscript requires revision and I would recommend major revision before accepting this manuscript for publication.	

SDI 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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	