SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_43090**
Title of the Manuscript:	**DESIGN AND EVALUATION OF IBUPROFEN SELF NANO-EMULSIFYING DRUG DELIVERY SYSTEM**
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. Consider modifying the title of the manuscript to "Formulation and evaluation of self-nano emulsifying drug delivery system using Ibuprofen". 2. Line 60, authors have mentioned 'dust control is a challenge'. On what context the discussion was cited and what is the meaning of that? 3. Line 62 and 63, words like evergreening, product life extension doesn't seem relevant to the discussion given. Please consider reframing it. 4. Please mention the need, logic and scientific robustness of the study conducted in the introduction section. 5. Line 99, 'The resulting supernatant was filtered'. What was the filtering device used should be mentioned. 6. Please use **'insert symbol'** for degree Celsius (Line 124). For example: **°C** 7. In the composition table, the unit for excipients are mentioned as mg. Did you convert volume into mass, using density for liquid excipients like sesame oil?? 8. Line 159-160, what is the basket method? How is it relevant to release rate determination? Is there any reference for the study? Please cite suitable references in Methodology section. 9. In Table 2, why ±SD was not used for loading efficiency? Is it not done? 10. Why no images (SEM or TEM) of the formulation have been given? DLS measurements are based on dilutions, where particle size would be less, if less in concentration, but that's not the confirmation of the size. It is strongly recommend putting images of the prepared formulations. 11. In line numbers 311 to 313 it is mentioned, "**This result is in consonant with the report that labrafac CC has a relatively shorter triglyceride chain, which is the reason behind the smaller mean droplet size of microemulsions formulated with it [29, 30]".** Please discuss it in detail. Recheck the citations. Is it relevant??	Okay, the title is now modified to - "Formulation and evaluation of self-nano emulsifying drug delivery system of Ibuprofen" Pharmaceutical dust is often generated during grinding, drying, mixing, pressing, and coating in the production and packaging of a pill as well as during the cleaning of equipment in a pharmaceutical manufacturing plant. Substances such as steroids, hormones or narcotics may pose a risk if they escape into the atmosphere. The ability to process LBF as solutions will minimize dust generation from actives and excipients often encountered with dry/powder/solid dosage forms. This has been removed. I think all that has been captured particularly in the last paragraph of the introductory section where the poor aqueous solubility property of ibuprofen was highlighted, the need, therefore, to present it in a solubilized form to enhance absorption. The procedures carried out to characterize the formulation shows the scientific robustness of the study. The resulting supernatant was filtered through a membrane filter. Effected The required volumes of the liquid excipients were converted to weights using their densities for easy measurement. The density of sesame oil was determined using a density bottle. Tripathi *et al.*, (2016) It is done, now effected. We don't have a Transmission electron microscope and our Scanning electron microscope is not functional. Neither are they available in laboratories accessible to us. We used what we have; the reported globule size is for the reported concentration. Similar observations were reported by Atef and Belmonte, (2008) in Formulation and in vitro and in vivo characterization of a phenytoin self-emulsifying drug delivery system (SEDDS) e u r o p e a n j o u r n a l o f p h a r m a c e u t i c a l s c i e n c e s. 3 5: 257–263. Tripathy *et al.*, (2016) which is in my list of references also attributed variations in droplet size of some formulations to differences in chain length of triglycerides components. I added this to the text "Oils consisting of long chain triglycerides have higher viscosity, this impact on the emulsification process which in turn have a strong

	12. The authors have mentioned that the pure drug show a release of 8.8%. Please discuss the reason why it showed such a low release. Why not the comparison made with a marketed formulation? 13. Figure 6: No ±SD is mentioned in the graph. Consider putting it. 14. Check the English throughout the manuscript, in particular check verb tenses and punctuation. Check the typewriting mistakes all over the manuscript. The English is poor and lack scientific meaning. Please take help form English editing service organization and reframe the whole manuscript. **Plagiarism Issue:** **Design and optimization of self-nanoemulsifying formulations for lipophilic drugs** Tianjing Zhao[1], Devid Maniglio[1,3], Jie Chen[2], Bin Chen[2], Antonella Motta[1,3] and Claudio Migliaresi[1,3] Published 6 March 2015 • © 2015 IOP Publishing Ltd Nanotechnology, Volume 26, Number 12	effect on the emulsion globule size [31]" The release rate assessment in this study was done to determine the extent of improvement in drug release (if any) of the formulated system as compared to the pure drug. The SNEDDS were not in a dosage form yet, SNEDDS was held in a dialyzing membrane, comparing such with a marketed formulation (a finish dosage form) will not be appropriate. The values for figure 6 (release rate profile) are in percentages, they were computed from averages of absorbance values. It is the absorbance values that contained ±SD. The percentages were computed from averages. The article has generally been revised and all my references have been stated. All citations were gotten from the references provided.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	There are many similar/same paper published in other reputed journals. The research seems to lack novelty and scientific robustness. No analytical characterization has been done to check the physicochemical characteristics changes of the drug and excipients.	