

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_126001
Title of the Manuscript:	FORMULATION AND EVALUATION OF COLON SPECIFIC MELOXICAM MICROCAPSULES FOR THE TREATMENT OF ARTHRITIS
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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript deals with preparation of meloxicam microcapsules using various combinations of polymers. The formulation aims at making sustained release dosage form. The manuscript compiles preformulation studies, preparation as well as characterization of prepared formulations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is appropriate	
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.	Size range of microcapsules could be incorporated in abstract	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections are appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Manuscript has focussed on all aspects of formulation development beginning from preformulation. Method of preparation and characterization techniques have been explained with results. Interpretation is also there but cited references to support the outcome has not been incorporated.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Recent references could be used to replace older references. More references should be added to justify source of methods used in the research work ie for compatibility studies, method of preparation, and all evaluation parameters. All references should be uniform in format as they are not in a single format.	
Minor REVISION comments	Conclusion could be elaborated	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Original FTIR spectra should be incorporated in place of scanned ones. 2. References must be cited to justify results during interpretation. 3. SEM images can be more clearer and it seems particle size distributin range is 600-800 micrometre in table and text but SEM images seem to indicate particles of the very small order. 	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chandan Sharma
Department, University & Country	University Institute of Pharma Sciences, Chandigarh University, India