



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_47691
Title of the Manuscript:	Synthesis of Morphine Loaded Hydroxyapatite Nanoparticles (HAPs) and Determination of Genotoxic Effect for Using Pain Management
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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Its an interesting topic for pharmaceutical application. Here are some comments for the improvement of the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract was not properly written and lacking important info. The abstract should have general information and problem statement, objectives that related to the research title, summarizes research methods, highlight the major findings based on R&D, conclusion and significant contribution of the research. 2. Line 45-50 (Introduction) are not relevant and need to be removed. 3. Line 112-113: repeating info with Line 96-98 4. Material and methods: The protocol needs to be straight to the point following standard journal format. Need to specify the amount of reagents used in mmol and gram. No more explanation and lit. review in the experimental section. Example (Line 147-148 and 167-167, etc) 4. Line 213-225: The instrument needs to be combined in a concise journal formats. Not written individually. 5. Figure 2 is a bit blur and no labelling. The discussion in the text doesn't correlate with peaks in Figure 2 6. Line 364: Need to be rewritten 7. Any financial support for the project. 	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zainab Ngaini
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Sarawak, Malaysia