

Journal Name:	PLANT CELL BIOTECHNOLOGY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PCBMB_12566
Title of the Manuscript:	Green synthesis of silver nanoparticles from leaf and flower extracts of R. indica and C. roseus
Type of the Article	Research

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Silver Nanoparticles are of importance but author should focus of its application and end use for which they have synthesized it as there is lot of work done on both the plants	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract should include result , discussion and conclusion in one or two sentence	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Conclusion should be precise brief and to the point , discussion should be in detail	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Recent references on the mentioned plants are not included in references	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Spelling corrections need to be done language can be further revised	
Optional/General comments	Work is repetition of already done work nothing different is done not even solvents or method is different	

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:	Shilpa Pravin Chaudhari
Department, University & Country	Savitribai Phule Pune University, India