

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_126384
Title of the Manuscript:	ADVANCES IN THE ORAL DELIVERY OF KETOPROFEN: A REVIEW
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	A strong revision of the article is needed because it currently lacks novelty and reads more as a literature review than a presentation of original research. The article's objectives are vague, preventing a clear understanding of its purpose and significance in advancing the field of ketoprofen drug delivery systems. Additionally, there is a lack of substantial knowledge and depth in the findings, with each result presented in an incomplete manner. Addressing these gaps will ensure the article presents a cohesive, insightful study with a focus on new findings and well-defined objectives that contribute meaningfully to the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Recent Developments in Oral Ketoprofen Delivery: Strategies for Enhanced Therapeutic Performance	
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.	The abstract contains numerous spelling and grammatical errors, along with irrelevant elaborations that detract from clarity. It lacks clear findings, and essential keywords are missing.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No it needs strict revision 1. Incorrect numbering throughout the document. 2. Terminology is inconsistent and incorrect. 3. Drug names should be capitalized. 4. General descriptions are present, but terminological elaboration is insufficient. 5. The text does not highlight the names of the researchers. 6. Effects of the drug on animals are not discussed. 7. Diagrams appear purposeless and seem included only to increase manuscript length. 8. The manuscript lacks scientific relevance in its current form. 9. Formatting is improper and inconsistent.	
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.	No	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Not enough references are mentioned. Manuscript should include more references and according to the journal's given set of instructions	
Minor REVISION comments	No	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Manuscript needs strict revision in order to be accepted. Instructions to authors should be very clear to the author and author should stick to it. More of the knowledge gained by author from the number of research works mentioned should be briefed so that the original content should not be diluted with undue elaboration and vague text formation.	

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:	Bhupinder Kaur
Department, University & Country	University Institute of Pharma Sciences, Chandigarh University, India