

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80158
Title of the Manuscript:	FORMULATION AND EVALUATION OF GABAPENTIN SUSTAINED RELEASE MATRIX TABLET USING HIBISCUS ROSA SINENSIS LEAVES MUCILAGE AS RELEASE RETARDANT
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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Under the side heading – Preparation of granules – it is mentioned that <i>Hibiscus rosa-sinensis</i> mucilage as superdisintegrant – but in matrix tablets – there will not be any superdisintegrant and the said material is actually used as matrix former.</b> - <b>The author should clarify on the above point</b></li> <li><b>Under in vitro release discussion – the below sentences are not clear and need to be reframed :</b> The dissolution studies of matrix tablet formulation F1 have shown 91.24% of drug release at the end of 12 hours. But the <i>in-vitro</i> release of formulation F1 shows only within 12 hours in phosphate buffer pH (6.8). This indicated that <i>in-vitro</i> release pattern of the formulations prepared happened to be sustained in comparison to that of the other formulations.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The placement of references in the text should be checked. For example, the references 10-12 are mentioned at the end of the sentence on aim of the study – in the last paragraph of the introduction. But they should be cited at the end of the previous sentence. ( a recheck on all other references will be beneficial for correct referencing )</li> <li>Table 2 – give correct units for tapped density and compressibility index</li> <li>In conclusions – the below sentence has to be changed or deleted It was observed that all the formulations were as per I.P. specification limits  Because IP does not give specifications for flow properties or tablet characteristics that were studied.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 1.6**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>K.V.R.N.S.Ramesh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>RAK College of Pharmaceutical Sciences, United Arab Emirates</b>