

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Original Manuscript_JPRI_118047</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Improved Topical Antifungal Medication using Sertaconazole Bilosomes: In vitro Permeability, Cytotoxicity, and Clinical Assessment</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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I appreciate the author's effort in preparing useful data for scientific purposes. Some corrections should be made to make the manuscript a better structure. Grammatical mistakes should be solved by some experts in English.</li> <li>The title of the article is suitable</li> <li>The abstract covers all necessary information and is summarized perfectly. However, the word limit has not been followed.</li> <li>The subsection and structure of the manuscript is suitable. However, the figures should be drawn in higher qualifications.</li> <li>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</li> <li>Most of the references refer to the late 1900s. Articles of 2023 and 2024 should be included. The structure of the reference is not unique in all references which puts the manuscript on the verge of rejection unless it is corrected in a unique style.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The introduction should be explained in more detail regarding academic literature/previous reports.</li> <li>SEM analysis should be added to the characterization</li> <li>Graphs in Fig. 1 should be in color to be well distinguished by readers.</li> <li>The graphs in Fig.3 are of low quality. The titles of the X, and Y axes are in unusual fonts. Also, insert wavenumbers of the characteristic peaks near the peaks or insert the symbol of bonds near the peaks.</li> <li>Please substitute (&amp;) with (and) anywhere in the manuscript.</li> <li>A unique form of writing should be observed in the text (Fig. or Figure)</li> <li>The "abstract" exceeded 250 words. Follow the authors' guidelines.</li> <li>Do not insert two parentheses in each other.</li> <li>Be careful to mention the first abbreviation with its word and not continue using the word again with its abbreviation.</li> <li>Correct space between words or numbers to be unique. For example, SB 5 or SB5/ 60 °C or 60°C</li> <li>Write Table or Fig in the first capital letter in the text.</li> <li>The sentences or words that are highlighted in blue color should be checked grammatically or literally / or using suitable prepositions or identifier</li> <li>The ones in yellow color should be corrected in the right form. All the text should be reviewed grammatically by an expert in English.</li> <li>Research Papers should follow the structure of Abstract, Introduction, Methodology, Results and Discussion, Conclusion, Acknowledgements, Competing Interests, Authors' Contributions, Consent (where applicable), Ethical approval (where applicable), and References plus figures and/or tables.)</li> <li>Why did the authors not study the antibacterial activity?</li> </ol>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sedigheh Azadi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Iran</b>