



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_67925
Title of the Manuscript:	DISINFECTION OF TANK WATER USING BIOGENIC SILVER NANOSILICA AS ANTI-MICROBIAL AGENTS IN JEDDAH CITY
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>The authors propose the application of nanotechnology in the purification of drinking water, a current topic of paramount importance to human health.</p> <p>The one who subscribes the corrections major corrections to the manuscript, with the security that the authors can solve it favorably and continue with the publishing process.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Homogenize in the manuscript the name of the microorganisms, all in italic or normal letters, place a point when the abbreviation requires it, according to the format of the journal. 2. Key words section: It is suggested to eliminate "TEM" y "MCF-7 cell line", because they were complementary techniques to the investigation. 3. The introduction suggests including the following cone citation link and the full address placing it in references: http://www.epagov/safewater/ccl/pdfs/report-ccl3-microbes-universepdf 4. The first mention in the text of "silver nanoparticles" must include its abbreviation, the manuscript first includes the abbreviation and the second time the term is used, the meaning is included. 5. Review in spelling writing, proper use of the dot between statements and paragraphs, omissions are presented that alter the meaning of the text. Example: "...these materials has increased our fears about their possible environmental, health and protection risks (The point needs to be included and followed) In an in vitro cell culture assay, AgNPs showed..." 6. Material and Methods section: Accurately describe the number of samples collected between drinking water from tanks and drinking water filtered with polypropylene filters. 7. The culture media used for the isolation of faecal coliforms are not selective for this group of bacteria, it is suggested that this description be removed (CLED Agar is a differential culture medium for bacteria from urine). 8. Include the right abbreviation "NCCLS". 9. When mentioning who provided the material includes the bibliographic citation, it is suggested to include the surname of the principal investigator or institution who granted the material followed by the bibliographic citation. The same situation is presented in the discussion, in the sections where the results of the manuscript are compared to that of other authors. 10. Homogenize the use of bold letters on the figure feet and table titles, according to the format of the magazine. In addition, sometimes the word "figure" is abbreviated and other times it is placed complete. 11. Table 1. It is recommended to include the origin of the samples, indicating whether they were taken from tank or water filtered with polypropylene filters. 12. In the section: "Quality parameters of tested water samples prior and post treatment with NSAgNP", include the number of samples per treatment. 13. Figure 2. It is recommended to change the format to bars or similar, indicating the individual value of each sample, the continuous line makes it appear that the values belong to a single sample in a period of time. 14. Table 2. Include statistical differences according to design and probability value. 15. Table 3. It is recommended to include the isolated water bacteria and inhibition halos that were generated in the drug sensitivity test, in addition to the reference values of the kit that was used. 16. Figure 3. Include statistical differences according to design and probability value. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>17. Figure 4. The description of results does not describe whether gene amplification in the included bacteria managed to identify different species among the genera. In discussion section it is mentioned that region of the rRNA gene employees in this work achieve the identification and differentiation between Candida species.</p> <p>18. Figure 5. Graph G. Increase the font size in axis and legend titles.</p> <p>19. In the paragraph that reads: "An IC50 of 35.8 µg/mL suggests that the biogenic silver nanoparticles are effective as anti-cancer and antimicrobial agent". The cytotoxicity test in the cell line cannot be used to support the anticancer property of AgNPs.</p> <p>20. Table 4, 5 and figure 6. Include statistical differences according to design and probability valor.</p> <p>21. It is suggested that the following paragraph in the discussion section be changed to results: "All the water samples analyzed showed average turbidity to be quite high with average between 18.5±0.03 to 26±0.29 NTU and high EC with average 279.49±50.93 µS/cm in comparison with the control filtered water samples".</p> <p>22. In the paragraph: "Regarding the antimicrobial activity, NSAGNPs were evaluated against two Gram-negative bacteria (<i>K. pneumoniae</i> and <i>E. coli</i>) and one fungal isolate (<i>Candida</i> spp.) by disk diffusion assay at various concentrations (10, 50, 100 µg/ml)". It is not necessary to include the values in parentheses, it is described in results. It is suggested to change the wording by highlighting the antibacterial property shown by NSAGNPs towards the most important bacteria in human health.</p> <p>23. In the paragraph: The viability of breast cancer cells was maximum (98.1 to 99.5 %) at concentrations (0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1.0, 10, 100 µg/ml) of biosynthesized NSAgNP. The concentration 100 g/ml should be eliminated, which indicates the following paragraph that causes inhibition of the viability of the cell line MCF-7.</p> <p>24. Indicate whether the proposed water purification technique leaves residues of NSAgNP that exceed the IC and consider to be risks of cell cytotoxicity.</p>	
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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Juan Carlos Hernández González</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo, Mexico</i>