

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81462
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and In-vitro,In-vivo Evaluation of Gastro Retentive Floating Tablets of Felodipine
Type of the Article	Research

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

	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the Materials and methods section please write the excipients initially as they are named (e.g. microcrystalline cellulose), and then use the abbreviation overall the whole text. What grade of MCC was used? The method was direct compression (please refer to that and why this method was preferred). - Please provide explanation about how and why the excipients were selected in order to achieve buoyancy (sodium bicarbonate). - The Carbopol grade is "Carbopal"? or Carbopol? - In the Materials and method section: "Angle of repose, bulk density, true density, Hausner ratio, and Carrs' index were all performed as per Indian pharmacopeia protocols – usually the protocols are briefly described in the articles. Please do. - In the Results section: put all the data in table (precompression parameters also). - The in vivo X-ray photographs should evidentiate the tablets position with a better marker. - For the in vitro dissolution test: commercialized formulation was compared to the 14 formulas? Where are they all displayed? The graph displays only the formulations between 8 and 14, but you discuss all. As I can see from Table 4, also F7 shows good dissolution kinetics (R2). Please provide explanation. - In the Conclusion section please explain in a manner that shows why Formulation 14 was better (with % HPMC of...etc) - The stability studies: usually display the before and after parameters that were observed. Please insert at least a more detailed comment. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - English language overall the article needs major improvement: in the abstract section you refer to gastric-retentive, but the term is "gastroretentive" - "Gastrointestinal", without hyphenation; microcrystalline, not micro-crystalline,. Pharmacopoeia with a capital P, etc. Please correct all the mistakes, because they are many. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The article shows good work in the field of tablet technology and the results are interesting. 	

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:	Eliza Gratiela Popa
Department, University & Country	"Grigore T. Popa" University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Iași, Romania