



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJPR_4288
Title of the Manuscript:	Preparation and Characterization of Mucoadhesive Buccal Film for Delivery of Meloxicam
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Comment to the manuscript number: 2013_BJPR_4288

“Preparation and Characterization of Mucoadhesive Buccal Film for Delivery of Meloxicam”.

The paper reports about preparation of mucoadhesive buccal films of meloxicam from different polymers and plasticizers to select the best formula. The article seems good but many clarifications are required.



SDI Review Form 1.6

- The introduction part not contains any previous work using the same drug or the same polymers.
- In Preparation of the buccal films, line 80, what is the conc. of Hcl used (please, specify.)
- The drug is practically in soluble, how the authors can add it to the dispersion in solution form or in suspension and which solvent used to dissolve the drug.
- The part 2.2.2.2. is use less and must be omitted.
- Meloxicam has very bad taste, what about the platability of the prepared film.
- In page 5 line 119, numbering must be corrected.
- In part 2.1.3.3. (in-vitro release) what about the amount of the drug in each sample.
- What is the size of each sample used for release?
- Hixon-Crowel model can not be applied, it must be omitted.
- Line 209 the name of model must be corrected.
- Line 232 this paragraph useless and must be omitted.
- Line 318, the values of correlation coefficient (r) must be added in new table and also n value from Pepas model.
- The discussion part is discussed only PG effect and omitted the formulations contains PEG 400 although it has solubilizing effect more than PG.
- Also, how can HEC, SCMC show similar release characters, although HEC more hydrophobic than SCMC.
- The DSC discussion is very poor and the authors should calculating the heat of fusion for each peak and compare its intensities.
- The Figures of DSC must be collected and overloaded of each group (Drug, polymer, PM and formulated film) for good comparison.
- The authors omitted the effect of PEG 400 and not discussed it is effect on its formulations.



SDI Review Form 1.6

- In figures 4,5 E there are exthothermic peaks not included in discussion.

Note: Anonymous Reviewer