



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_23624
Title of the Manuscript:	AN OVER VIEW OF CHRONOTHERAPEUTIC DRUG DELIVERY SYSTEMS BASED ON FLOATING PULSATILE CONCEPT
Type of the Article	Review papers

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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	- Line No. 9, improper meaning. What is 'their' in the sentence. Only medicines improve patient health rather than patient health affect therapeutic efficacy and minimise adverse effects. - Line No. 24-29, repeated lines. Change the paragraph. - Lines No. 89-94, sentences donot show any meaning. It is not clear whether growth hormone, TSH increase or decrease? Also which phase of a day shows the change? - Line 127, in vivo should be italics. - Line No. 141-143. Paragraph does not indicate use of chronotherapeutic drug delivery system for chronopharmacotherapy. - Line No. 209, authors have not described PDDS elsewhere in the text. Therefore, a brief introduction to PDDS should be given before discussing its novel approaches.	- It has been corrected. - Paragraph was changed. - It has been corrected. - Corrected accordingly. - Changed accordingly. - Brief introduction related to PDDS has mentioned.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	7. Line 321, Which mathematical model the author is talking about? 8. Line 366 does not show any meaning. Which system is author talking about? 9. Section 7-9 should be rewritten with emphasis on the different parameters for evaluation. The author should cite some case studies where characterization revealed potential outcomes w.r.t pulsatile + floating drug delivery. There is a serious issue of plagiarism for the manuscript. The report for a single paragraph is given below Top of Form Design and evaluation of pH sensitive multi-particulate ... Compare Text of pH sensitive multi-particulate systems for changed permeability of the coating membrane are primarily involved in the control of release dosage forms are development of low density floating multiparticulate pulsed-release dosage forms possessing gastric retention capabilities has also http://www.researchgate.net/publication/26454055_Design_and_evaluation_of_pH_sensitive_multi-particulate_systems_for_chronotherapeutic_delivery_of_Diltiazem_hydrochloride Bottom of Form	7. These lines were removed. 8. These lines were re moved 9. Case studies were cited 80% of review article has been modified.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Top of Form 7. MATERIALS AND METHODS: - Rajiv Gandhi University of ... Compare Text GOLI . M.pharm. Ph.D has also been addressed with increasing focus on the upcoming multiparticulate-pulsatile technologies being exploited on an industrial scale http://www.rguhs.ac.in/cdc/onlinecdc/uploads/04_P052_13106.doc Bottom of Form Top of Form Multiparticulate formulation approach to pulsatile drug ... Compare Text and changed permeability of the coating membrane are primarily involved multi-particulate pulsatile release delivery. 2.3. Systems with changed membrane http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016836590800744X	
Minor REVISION comments	Suggested in the manuscript	
Optional/General comments	Should be accepted after revision. Authors should also the language of the manuscript.	Corrected.