



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	<p>The therapeutic efficacy of any medication depends on the percent active principles that attain the receptor sites at its target organs. It is not surprising that, even very efficient drugs still have less than 100% of their active principles attaining target sites. Various factors account for this: preservation methods, solubility in physiological fluids, permeability across biological membranes, and interactions with endogenous molecules, among others. It is interesting how authors, using specific surfactants and co surfactants, were able to come out with an Ibuprofen-SNEDDS with a promising efficacy. I find the work very significant and of high quality, though with the following few modifications to make:</p> <p>Line 190: to define the various terms in the formula for % inhibition of paw oedema</p> <p>Line 196: to slash off the title</p>	<p>The terms have now been defined</p> <p>Done</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paper is somehow lengthy, though rich with information. I would invite authors to thoroughly revise the various sections especially the methodology section of abstract and the discussion; - Some grammatical errors are spotted within and need to be checked 	
Optional/General comments	<p>I think work is rich with practical information worth-exploiting by a wider audience; pharmaceutical firms, pharmacists, clinical researchers, health workers, academics, etc. and so, needs to be considered upon revision.</p>	