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	The authors evaluated A new hydrophilic cellulose matrix (*I-hydrocel*) as a tablet disintegrant in paracetamol tablet formulation in comparison with maize starch (MS).I think it is not a sounding point and the manuscript is poorly written and not well organized, in addition it has various drawbacks as follows: 1. The introduction is poorly written. 2. Also, the methods lack technical points. where, the authors in line 86, only write the ref. without any details of the process. 3.In line 95 what is the conc. of the slurry of gelatin? 4. In line 97,the authors stated that, each drying process was carried out in an oven at 60^0C without mentioning the drying process was carried out for what period?. Is paracetamol is stable at 60^0C? 5. In line 97, the authors stated that, the granules are stored and did not mention the condition of storage? 6. Through the determination of granule characteristics or evaluation of tablets, the authors mentioned only the name of the methods used without any details. 7. In line 152, the authors said that, statistical analysis was performed, however they did not mention these data in results and discussion part. sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses should be carried out. 8. Moreover, in results and discussion part: a. Data are not well controlled and not robust . b. Authors should not provide relevant and current references during discussion, it is poorly written. 9. Conclusion is loose.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	In general the manuscript is not well organized, not clearly presented and structured, the authors did not provide sufficient references in discussion, English is not satisfactory. The reviewer suggests that, the authors should perform read-through before finalizing the manuscript, check for similar subjects and try to link their work to this field . Finally, The whole manuscripit should be improved to great extent.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Rehab Mohammad Mohammad Yusif Helal***
Department, University & Country	***Department of pharmaceutics and pharmaceutical technology, College of pharmacy, Taibah university, Saudi Arabia*** ***And*** ***Mansoura university, Egypt***