



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Microbiology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JAMB_50137 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Impact of Different Chemically Synthesized Silver nanoparticles on Nosocomial Infection |
| Type of the Article | Original Research 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://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 | <p>Whilst the research work is laudable the manuscript has been poorly written and replete with a lot of grammatical errors. The presentation and the discussion of the results is very poor. For example, the characterisation of the synthesised Ag-NPs ought to be presented and discussed thoroughly before its antimicrobial effect is discussed. TEM results were not even well discussed. What is the unit of concentration in Table 3.</p> <p>The aim and title of the research should be reviewed to include the size effect of the Ag-NPs on their antibacterial activity. Infact, this is the major highlight of this paper and it should be well presented and discussed.</p> <p>Also, the paper should be proof-read by an English expert before re-submission. For example, consider the following sentence, PVP-Ag-NPs were prepared according to Van Dong et al. [30] by adding 0.5 ml of 30mM of tri sodium citrate (TSC) in 50 ml triple dist. water under continuous stirring, then add 1 ml of 5 mM of AgNO₃, where past and present tense has been mixed and this is the same in most parts of the paper.</p> <p>As a result, our findings depicted that the MICs for <i>E. coli</i>, <i>P. mirabilis</i>, <i>K. pneumoniae</i> and MRSA were 10⁻². This statement does not have any physical meaning since the value of the MICs does not carry any unit.</p> <p>I suggest the manuscript should be wholly revised, comprehensively written by comparing with similar reports in literature and given to an expert English editor for revision.</p> | The manuscript has been modified |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Optional/General 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) |
|---|--|--|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |