Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_119740**
Title of the Manuscript:	**DESIGNING AND EVALUATING PIPERINE-LOADED DOCETAXEL NANOPARTICLES**
Type of the 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.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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** 2. **Is the title of the article suitable?** **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** 4. **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **The stucture os the manuscript is clear and easy to follow.** 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.** **The refereces are in acordance.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	The manuscript is a standard study of nanoparticle design. The research applies a interesting stratagy of co-encapsulating an active ingredient with a bioenhancer. Considering that the biological effect was not evaluated. The term "evaluation" in the title should be replaced with "characterization". The abstract accurately describes the article. The conclusion of the abstract, as well as in the article, should be revised in the sense that the phrase "enhances bioavalibility potencial" cannot be inferred from the assays that were performed. Or, perhaps, this should be better discussed as a strong hypothesis in another section. The manuscript is scientifically correct, but the methods should be better described. The materials should present their origin and purity (ex. Acetone P.A.) and should be written in full form, DMSO is abbreviated. In pre-formulation studies the FTIR was not described, but FTIR results are shown. Also, in this subsection an investigation of drug excipient interaction is mentioned but not described and the results of this test is not clear. The software used for the release Kinect modelling was not cited. Concerning the results. The presented results do not show their standard deviations in the graphs or tables, leading to believe that they were not performed in triplicates. The stability assay does not have numeric results and it is stated that "particle size did not significantly change", but no statistical analyses is described. In regards to the conclusion, I suggest that phrases such as "The results indicate that combining a bioenhancer with an anticancer drug in a nanoparticle formulation can significantly improve the drug's bioavailability." be removed. This can be discussed in the section "results and discussions" and brought as a hypothesis bases on scientific literature.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The grammar of this manuscript should be revised.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Cassia Britto Detoni**
Department, University & Country	**Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil**