

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_101964
Title of the Manuscript:	Preformulation Studies Of Varenicline for Formulation and Development of an Orally Disintegrating Film
Type of the Article	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:

(<https://www.journalpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes, the manuscript can be useful for scientific community and will be useful in developing a novel dosage form</b></p> <p>2. <b>No, the title can be reframed like -</b> Preformulation Studies Of Varenicline for Development of a novel Orally Disintegrating Film formulation</p> <p>3. <b>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</b></p> <p>5. <b>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</b></p> <p>6. <b>The references are sufficient and recent.</b></p> <p>7. <b>Suggestions:</b></p> <p>a) The language of the manuscript needs to be corrected . There are grammatical mistakes in introduction section which makes it difficult to understand .</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	No, the quality needs to be improved to make it suitable for scholarly communication	
<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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Vidhi Bapna Kumath
Department, University & Country	JS Ayurveda Mahavidyalaya, Adenwala Mahagujarat University, India