

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_121068
Title of the Manuscript:	Comprehensive Characterization of Novel Drug Delivery Systems: A Pre- and Post-Formulation Insights
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive overview of novel drug delivery systems (NDDS), highlighting their potential to enhance therapeutic efficacy and minimize side effects. By detailing various characterization techniques, including spectroscopic and thermal analyses, the manuscript serves as a valuable resource for researchers aiming to optimize drug formulations. Additionally, the emphasis on in vitro studies offers insights into the practical applications of these systems, fostering innovation in pharmaceutical development. Personally, I appreciate this manuscript for its thoroughness and clarity, as it effectively bridges the gap between theoretical concepts and practical applications in drug delivery, making it a useful reference for both new and experienced researchers in the field.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is kind of appropriate but I have suggestions which could also mean the same so that it could be of some help to understand the paper more clearly.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Advancements in Novel Drug Delivery Systems: Techniques for Pre- and Post-Formulation Analysis" 2. "Characterizing Novel Drug Delivery Systems: Insights into Formulation and Efficacy" 3. "Exploring Novel Drug Delivery Systems: A Comprehensive Guide to Characterization Techniques" 	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive as it succinctly summarizes the key aspects of the manuscript. It outlines the significance of novel drug delivery systems (NDDS) in enhancing therapeutic efficacy and minimizing side effects. The abstract also highlights the various characterization techniques employed in both pre- and post-formulation stages, such as physicochemical properties, spectroscopic analysis, and in vitro drug release studies.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes they are appropriate in manner.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The Manuscript employs established methodologies, such as physicochemical analysis, spectroscopic techniques, and in vitro drug release studies, which are widely recognized in the field of pharmaceutical research. The inclusion of both pre- and post-formulation insights reflects a comprehensive understanding of the drug development process, ensuring that the findings are relevant and applicable to real-world scenarios. One potential issue could be the need for more specific examples or case studies to illustrate the application of the discussed techniques in actual NDDS development. While the manuscript provides a solid theoretical framework, incorporating empirical data or examples could enhance its practical relevance and further validate the claims made.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and but the presence of many papers from 90s suggest a little proofread required in the data so that it could be more specific or could help the scholarly community more or in specific point of view.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English is just in proper and in simple sentences but require a minimum adjustment so that it could be more scholarly.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper needs a little rework and thus it could be published.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aman Suresh T
Department, University & Country	Sandip Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, India