

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_72225
Title of the Manuscript:	FORMULATION AND EVALUATION OF ORODISPERSIBLE TABLET FOR ANTI-ASTHAMATIC DRUG
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Overall a good attempt by authors to formulate and evaluate orodispersible tablets of salbutamol. However, the writing part needs considerable improvement with justification of following queries.</p> <p>Title: Do not convey the actual study undertaken as evaluation is conducted only on formulations of salbutamol. Hence rather than generalising the topic being specific gives better understanding for readers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abstract: Being an original research article the abstract should have been written with subtopics (background, methodology, results and conclusion). Please reframe abstract to include the same.</li> <li>2. Introduction:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Please justify the reason for including US FDA definition of orodispersible tablet (ODT) in introduction whereas European pharmacopoeia has been quoted in abstract.</li> <li>b. Please add examples to table 1 to make it more comprehensive</li> <li>c. References are not cited please add suitable references</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Material and methods:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The authors have added formulation and evaluation techniques of ODT in methodology section, which appears inappropriate. Please add the concise version of same in introduction.</li> <li>b. Explain the basis for selecting salbutamol for the study</li> <li>c. Please explain standardisation methods employed during study.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Results and discussion section is too concise, please elaborate all study results and in discussion section make a comparative analysis to similar studies being conducted.</li> </ol> <p>Conclusion: Please reframe to make it more comprehensive.</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	-	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	-	

**Review Form 1.6**

**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>  It is ideal to obtain ethical clearance from institutional ethics committee. The "Not applicable" certificate must be by ethics committee rather than researchers	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tejus A</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>