

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_108477
Title of the Manuscript:	The Utilization of Response Surface Methodology (RSM) In the Optimization of Diclofenac Sodium (DS) Liposomes Formulate Through the Thin Film Hydration (TFH) Technique with Involving Computational Method
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript title is likely to be of scientific importance due to its focus on optimizing drug delivery, its use of advanced methodology, and its potential to impact the broader pharmaceutical and medical research community. 2. Yes, it's suitable. Ultimately, the suitability of the title depends on the audience and the conventions of the specific journal or publication where the article will appear. It's essential to adhere to the guidelines and expectations of the target journal and to ensure that the title accurately represents the content of the article. 3. Yes comprehensive but in abstract section, method of preparation by TFH technique have to be explain, which is missing in it. 4. Yes, subsection and structure of the manuscript is appropriate. 5. No, it's not scientifically correct. More than 40 grammar and writing mistakes are found in it. 6. No, the references are not sufficient. Author has to correct the format of the references as per the author's guidelines mentioned. All references are not set as per the concern. 7. In this manuscript, spelling mistakes are found. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, suitable except the writing mistakes and spelling mistakes. After the revision on mentioned suggestions, I am sure about the article will be suitable for scholarly communications. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It's important to ensure that the references cited in a scientific paper are accurate and up-to-date to maintain the credibility and reliability of the research. Kindly do the same in the given manuscript.</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sanket Kumar
Department, University & Country	Maulana Azad University, India