



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design is not well justified because as author want to determine the effect of MCC-F and MCC-L but amount of API is also varying so how could you justify that API is not effecting to desired response? 2. Determination of wavelength maxima and standard curve should be mentioned under Preformulation study. 3. Method for flow rate is not mentioned in method section. 4. Crushing strength was determined by using Monsanto hardness tester in Newton instead of kg/cm², how? 5. heading 2.5.6 & 2.5.7 image showing wavelength and standard curve can be included. 6. Heading 2.5.10 stability study should be revised as per ICH guidelines. 7. Heading 3.1.4 DCF 2, 3, 4 & DCL 4 all are having values >1? Why. <p>***Author need to revise whole manuscript as it is not being justified whether researcher want to study the impact of ratio of MCC obtained by drying or by freeze drying.</p> <p>***Discussion part should be focused on impact of polymer used by different techniques.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The experimental design was to elucidate mechanical and in vitro release of the formulation. Both MCC-F and MCC-L were used at comparable portions or ratios which was designed to increase as the MCC's decreased in the formulation. The fact that the API could not be carried beyond 40 % w/w shows that the API on its own cannot be tableted alone. An earlier article preceeding this had elucidated the flow and compaction. 2. Determination of maximum wavelength of absorption and standard calibration curve have been mentioned as considered appropriate. 3. Method for flow rate has been added to the manuscript 4. The authors believe that their expression of crushing strength in kgF is not out of acceptable order and wish to retain it. 5. Headings have been suitably adjusted where necessary. They have been painted yellow in the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Equations must be written using equation tool. 2. Equation numbering format should be uniform. 3. Reference should be mention under is disintegration test (2.5.5). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Equations have been written using the equation editor. 2. Equation numbering format has been made uniform 3. Reference has been made under disintegration test.
Optional/General comments	<p>Author need to revise whole manuscript as it is not being justified whether researcher want to study the impact of ratio of MCC obtained by drying or by freeze drying.</p> <p>Discussion part should be focused on impact of polymer used by different techniques.</p>	<p>The necessary revisions have been done by the authors.</p>

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>	