

## Review Form 1.6

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>                          |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JPRI_82188   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Evaluating the effectiveness of various Vitamin D formulations after 8 weeks of treatment |
| Type of the Article      | Original  |

### **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 | <p>Abstract:<br/>- Proper length and information given, representative of the information of the whole text.</p> <p>Main text:<br/>* Introduction: it could be slightly abbreviated.<br/>* Methods: authors widely explain the exclusion criteria, but inclusion criteria in relation to calcium and 25-OH-vitamin D levels, should also be specified.<br/>* Results:<br/>.The following sentence should be placed into the "methods" section: "As per the laboratory range for vitamin D, &lt;10 ng/mL indicates deficiency, 10 to 30 ng/mL indicates insufficiency, 30 to 100 ng/mL indicates sufficiency and &gt;100 ng/mL indicates hypervitaminosis D."<br/>.The following sentence does not actually belong to results (it should be placed in the "discussion" section):"Although the numerical values suggest that capsule had a higher value than chewable tablet" (it is an investigator's consideration).<br/>* Discussion:<br/>. Authors evaluate the effect of different formulation of oral vitamin D on the levels of serum 25-OH-vitamin D and calcium. Nevertheless, in the discussion they cite studies who analyze the effect of vitamin D supplementation on muscle strength, or on the risk of hip and non-vertebral fracture. Authors do not comment/review studies evaluating the effect of vitamin D supplementation on levels of serum calcium. The comparison is difficult to understand. There is no a direct comparison.<br/>* Conclusion:<br/>. The authors conclude: "the cost-effectiveness, palatability, and patient-friendliness of chewable tablet over other formulations in the study may be considered as advantageous factors for patient compliance". But they do not explain how they measure the acceptability and compliance and the different acceptability and compliance (if any) of the three different formulations.</p> |  |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <p>Abstract:<br/>- Correct spaces between words (line 1: vitamin D "has a..."). There are missing and extra spaces along the abstract.<br/>- Consider full stop between the different sections of the abstract (introduction, methods, results...).</p> <p>Main text:<br/>- Correct spaces between words.</p> <p>Discussion:<br/>- Consider a full stop after " The rise in calcium level was in the order: chewable tablet&gt;capsule&gt;granules."<br/>- Consider a full stop after: "after vitamin D3 supplementation".</p>   |  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    |  |  |

**Review Form 1.6**

**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><br><br>Ethics Committee approval was obtained.<br>Authors declare to follow good clinical practice guidelines. |  |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Ana Batalla Cebey</b>                                |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University Hospital Complex of Pontevedra, Spain</b> |