SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRIMPS_49624**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The Mechanical and In Vitro Release Properties of Diazepam from Tablets Containing Fluid Bed Dried and Lyophilized Cocos nucifera Microcrystalline Cellulose**
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. There are some grammatical and typographical mistakes in the manuscript. I corrected and highlighted in RED. Please check again. 2. There is a correlation between Bulk density, True density, Tapped density, Angle of repose, Carr's compressibility index, and Hausner's ratio. Establish and write an essay on correlation with respect to flow rate. 3. Diazepam in general shows multiple lambda max (). How did the authors choose a single lambda max at 246 nm? 4. Whenever there is any Method, Technique, or Formula, please provide adequate reference(s) for support. 5. Write about the possible pattern of drug release (kinetics) from the formulation as shown in the dissolution graph. 6. Describe the changes observed in some more parameters (dissolution, friability, disintegration, strength, etc.) in accelerated stability studies. 7. Authors are expected to compare with a marketed formulation and must establish the "Similarity Factor" which will be a marker milestone for future industrial technology translation. $$\text{Similarity factor } (f_2) = 50 \log \left\{ \left[1 + 1/n \sum_{t=1}^{n} (Rt - Tt)^2 \right]^{-0.5} \times 100 \right\}$$ 8. A focus on future perspectives in the conclusion part is essential. 9. References are not framed according to the Instructions to Authors. 10. A MINOR REVISION is advised for the manuscript.	1. The grammatical and typographical errors pointed out in the manuscript are acknowledged and have been taken care of. 2. The flow rate determination methodology have been included. Likewise the result and correlation of flow rate have been addressed. 3. The authors chose the lambda mass based on the highest reading that was observed during a manual scanning of absorbances of diazepam which depicts the most prominent peak. 4. More references have been added to sections where they were non-existent *ab initio* or were scanty and needed more support. 5. The changes observed in some parameters in the stability studies have been included in the manuscript. 6. The authors did not do the similarity factor check with any commercial brand because the experiment was designed at concentrations of diazepam far above the commercially available ones. The essence was not only to check the tabletability of the excipient with diazepam but also to elucidate the carrying capacity or dilution capacity. 7. The conclusion and reference sections have been revised to accommodate the issues pointed out.
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	