



Name:	<u>UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3201
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Study on the Structural, Morphological, Optical Properties, and Antibacterial Activities of Ag/ZnO Nanocomposites Prepared through Co-precipitation and Green Synthesis Routes
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer think is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

[\(http://mbimph.com/index.php/UPJOZ/editorial-policy\)](http://mbimph.com/index.php/UPJOZ/editorial-policy)



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The field is emerging now adays, the current work depicts the formation of nanocomposite using two different methods. I guess, the work would gain attention.</p> <p>Yes, it is also good but, please make It more concise.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Almost. However, in the materials and method section, authors must separate the antibacterial activity from the characterization section. Make it another subheading entitled 'Antibacterial Assay'.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes provided references are enough. I have a few more suggestions which are given below.</p> <p>1- The authors mentioned that the synthesized nanocomposite was collected using centrifugation at 600rpm. Please check again, nanoparticles can't be sedimented at low centrifugation.</p> <p>2- The manuscript has some grammatical</p>	



	mistakes. Please correct them.	
Minor REVISION comments	I have carefully read the given manuscript. I have concluded that the current state of the manuscript is not able to be accepted or published because it requires some changes. After the recommended changes, it can be accepted. However, I decided to put this manuscript in minor revision.	
Optional comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abbas Aziz
Department, University & Country	University of Sindh, Pakistan