



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>)



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	1. Introduction contains a long detail of dosage form, which should be curtailed and indepth information should be provided on hydrogel matrix system which is your major aim as per the title of article. 2. Introduction provides theoretical inputs on concept of dissolution and disintegration; while writing a research paper we keep a focus on considering the researches already done in context to your category of polymers. 3. No references on previous workdone has been given which shows that it inspired the author to work in the aforesaid direction. 4. Major referencing missing when the authors explain the mechanism of water uptake by starch in the introductory part. 5. Introduction should be more planned in terms of writing a research paper, it gives a read of review article. 6. Author is reporting, that the polymer they are working on is processed in laboratory, so purity can't be claimed. No data about polymer is provided. 7. Under evaluation, line number 143 to 146, author is using USP methods but dissolution temperature is mentioned wrong. 8. Authors have formulated according to British Pharmacopoeia, valuated through United states Pharmacopoeia and result is again compared in reference to British Pharmacopoeia 9. Dissolution profile is totally unclear, especially the release graph. It cannot be interpreted. 10. Around 90% drug release is shown in first 20 minutes, how can release be nearly same for next 40 minutes when only 10 % drug is remaining to release. Can polymer sustain the drug release? Plagiarism Issue: 1. http://www.rsisinternational.org/Issue24/39-43.pdf (9 matches) 2. http://globalresearchonline.net/journalcontents/volume6issue1/Article-022.pdf (6 matches) 3. http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jpbs/papers/Vol11-issue5/Version-3/A1105030105.pdf (3 matches) 4. http://www.globalresearchonline.net/journalcontents/volume7issue2/Article-014.pdf (3 matches) 5. http://www.ijapbr.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Formulation-Development-and-Evaluations-of-Immediate-Release-Tablet-of-Clopidogrel-Bisulfate.pdf (2 matches) Over all 13% Plagiarism reported.	1. The long details have been curtailed. 2. These ideas have been utilized to improve on the review of literature. 3. Reference on the previous work on I-hydrocel has been included. This is currently "in press" 4. Some references have been added. 5. Comments noted. 6. Polymer was developed by the authors locally and previous works done on it are reported and cited in this current work. 7. Noted and some corrections made. 8. Noted 9. Dissolution tests repeated entirely in phosphate buffer, pH 5.8 as specified in USP . 10. Since dissolution was repeated, current interpretation of dissolution profile now documented.
Minor REVISION comments	1. Introduction line 27 & 28, Language is not scientifically correct. 2. Introduction line 59, give exact value reported in literature, you cannot give range. 3. Introduction line 37 & 38, Explanation is partial theoretical and not satisfactory. 4. Line 61, "faster dissolution" or "faster disintegration". What does the author mean by "faster"? 5. Line 72 introduction; Justify why only maize starch and not any other? 6. Line 89, Methods, Explain why Paracetamol and not any other drug?	1. Reviewer's comments have been taken into consideration and changes were effected. 2. It is important to state that pharmaceutical excipients utilized as disintegrants, binders, lubricants, etc, officially have a range of percentage composition they offer such applicability and they are so stated in the literature review in the introduction. 3. The sentences have been modified.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	7. Under methods,author have given % of excipients used. Total tablet weight must be mentioned so that the percentage can be calculated. Any research work must not be vague, it must be reproducible therefore author needs to give clear data wherever required. 8. Line number 170, Conventional release or Immediate release? Or both? 9. Line 201 of conclusion; if in all parameters maize starch is better; how can you say that your polymer can replace maize starch in formulation? Justify.	4. The word “faster” has been replaced with the word “more rapid and enhanced”. 5. Maize starch has remained a useful natural product applicable as a disintegrant. It was chosen as standard to compare <i>I-hydrocel</i> being a natural product also. Moreover, maize starch is readily available and affordable as at the time of the design of the work. 6. Paracetamol is a poorly compressible and poorly water soluble drug. Since the extent of disintegration and the ability of the disintegrant to take up water determines the extent of dissolution of the API, it was chosen to evaluate the extent I-hydrocel, being hydrophilic will enhance its dissolution. 7.The target total tablet weight of 620 mg has been shown in Table 1 showing the percentage composition of the ingredients used in the granulation. 8. Immediate release. 9. The concluding statements have been streamlined.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	More of books and less of researches already performed have been quoted under “REFERENCES”. This should be replaced by like wise work performed priorly.	Noted