



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	ABSTRACT Line 2: linagliptin-loaded What authors wrote under “aim” should rather constitute the “background”. Meanwhile, it would be better to draw the “background” information from the second sentence of line 56 to line 62 of the “introduction”. MATERIALS & METHODS - Line 71-74: to revise sentence for coherence; - Line 201-203: to define the different terms in the equation Otherwise, excellent. RESULTS & DISCUSSION Good! Have earlier similar studies been conducted on the same subject matter? If so, what is the general trend of findings with respect to authors’?	ABSTRACT Line 2: linagliptin-loaded Necessary correction was made on “aim” and “introduction” section and highlighted. MATERIALS & METHODS - Line 71-74: It has been revised and corrected in accordance and highlighted. - Line 201-203: Different terms used in the equations were defined, namely n was the slope whereas K was the anti log of intercept found in Korsmeyer-Peppas equation and highlighted. RESULTS & DISCUSSION In our search, we haven't found similar studies on the same subject matter so far.
Minor REVISION comments	Sentences need thorough revision	
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)	