

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_130203
Title of the Manuscript:	Stability Evaluation of Acetylsalicylic Acid in Commercial Aspirin Tablets Under Different Storage Conditions
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The research raises a topic that can be addressed by the drug protocol approved by the World Medicines Organization. The research needs additions to improve the scientific research topic.	The authors express their gratitude for the thorough review of the manuscript and the valuable suggestions and comments provided. This constructive feedback has significantly contributed to enhancing the quality and clarity of the work.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	The title of the manuscript remains unchanged as suggested.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	The abstract of the manuscript remains unchanged as suggested.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The research needs additions to improve the scientific research topic.	Based on reviewer's suggestion, we have carefully reviewed the manuscript and incorporated additional information and clarifications where necessary to further strengthen the scientific rigor of the study. These enhancements are reflected in the revised version of the manuscript. We appreciate reviewer's feedback, which has contributed to improving the quality and depth of our research.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Need more new references	Several more recent references have been added as suggested.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need more improvement	We have carefully reviewed the manuscript and made necessary revisions to improve the quality of the language and ensure it meets the standards for scholarly communication. The revised version has been edited for clarity, grammar, and academic tone.
Optional/General comments	The research needs additions to be considered useful scientific research.	We thank the reviewer for his/her general comment and suggestion to enhance the scientific value of the research. In response, we have made the following improvements to the manuscript: <div><div>1.</div><div>Introduction:</div><div>Additions have been made to provide a broader context and include more recent references to support the study's relevance.</div></div> <div><div>2.</div><div>Table 1:</div><div>Modifications have been made to Table 1 to address missing information and improve clarity.</div></div> <div><div>3.</div><div>Materials and Methods:</div><div>This section has been expanded to provide a more detailed description of the analytical methods, ensuring reproducibility.</div></div> <div><div>4.</div><div>Discussion:</div><div>The discussion has been extended to provide a deeper analysis of the results, incorporating insights on degradation products and their implications.</div></div> These changes aim to enhance the scientific rigor and utility of the research. If there are additional areas for improvement, we welcome further suggestions.

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	The authors declare that there are no ethical issues in the manuscript. Responses to the reviewer's specific comments have been provided in the sections above. All necessary corrections and revisions have been made and are highlighted in yellow in the final version of the manuscript.