



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
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>)

**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	<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 AgNO<sub>3</sub>, 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<sup>-2</sup>. 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>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<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)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Ehi-Eromosele C.O.</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Covenant University, Nigeria</i></b>