



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_37119
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on a Hydrophilic Cellulose Matrix derived from Ipomoea batatas Tubers III: Application as a Disintegrant in Paracetamol Tablet Formulation
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	1. Title: the use <i>Matrix</i> on the title should be reevaluated since there is nothing connected to either matrix system nor matrix tablet observed in the the whole research. In this experiment, the hydrophylic cellulose used in the experiment is just hydrophilic polymer, not a matrix 2. In Line 62, statement about superdisintegrators is out of the area of this research, better to be removed. 3. The word matrix in Line 86, better to be removed 4. It is better to show the result of cellulose characterization before moving to formulation. (after line 88) 5. Reference used should be new and actual, at least half of the reference coming from last 10 year, not from very old one	1. The reviewer's comments was taken into considering. Changes were effected. 2. The superdisintegrants aspect of the introduction were removed. 3. The reviewer's comment has been adhered to. 4. The processing and characterisation of the hydrophilic cellulose (<i>I-hydrocel</i>) has been documented as cited in reference no. 12. The current work was designed to address the application of <i>I-hydrocel</i>. The authors do not see the need to repeat the results of the characterisation and that is the reason it was mentioned and cited appropriately.
Minor REVISION comments	1. Line 162 and 181, please give more information about the table 2. Line 188, please add more explanation on results of the drug release, and compare bentween the two polymer used	Noted
Optional/General comments	The article need to be rivised, the reference should be up dated	