



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_44198
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro and ex vivo Studies of Linagliptin Loaded Non-Ionic Surfactant Vesicles Using Statistical Optimization
Type of the 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	Line No 287, Ex vivo release profile of linagliptin loaded niosomes formed by a) EIM and b) TFHM is given in Fig.5. It is supposed to be Fig. 6. Introduction part need to be extended further by including the following information with few references 1. Why present study is important and what is the knowledge gap in the previous studies (Problem statement is not clear) 2. Research Hypothesis to be included based on the previous studies. In the discussion part, Compare the results with previously published papers in related to the research and include few references.	Line No 287, It has been corrected and highlighted. Necessary information has been added. In brief, linagliptin is a BCS class-III drug which suffers from low bioavailability due to its decreased permeability. Attempt has been taken in this study to improve its bioavailability by means of improving permeability. In this regard, niosomes were formulated because of their proven efficiency in increasing permeability and highlighted. We haven't found similar research work on the same subject matter in our search so far. That's why currently it's not possible to compare.
Minor REVISION comments	Some of the references are not uniformly written. Authors need to follow the reference format of the Journal.	It has been checked corrected.
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>