

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JPRI_97204</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Stabilization of a pickering emulsion by nanoparticles of Eudragit RSPO and polyepsilon caprolactone: Contact angle measurement and surface tension studies.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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. 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>1- I would like to humbly praise the effort of the Authors to make this interesting and beneficial article.</p> <p>2- The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3- The abstract of the article is sufficient.</p> <p>4- Subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>5- The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6- Line 116-117, reference is required for the "cumulant-based method".</p> <p>7- Line 167, reference is required for the "Wilhelmy blade method".</p> <p>8- Lines 213-215, 252-253, 361 show a real problem of using a different language in the writing "French was used", so it must be written in the same language of the article "English".</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It's suitable, but around 150 spelling and organizational changes were done and corrected.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>It was an impressive work. A few minor modifications are required.</p>	

### 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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmed Sa Ali Agha
Department, University & Country	Petra University, Jordan