



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJPR_8495
Title of the Manuscript:	FORMULATION and EVALUATION of OPTIMIZED CLOTRIMAZOLE EMULGEL FORMULATIONS
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 <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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript has serious English mistakes, and then, I strongly suggest the revision of all the text for a native speaker; 2. The experimental desing needs to be referenced; 3. In the content of table 1, is the values presented for Y1 and Y2 obtained by the equation previous presented in 2.2.2 ? If yes, I can suppose that the predicted values presented in table 7 are 43.22 for Y1 and 57.5 for Y2. Is it right ? 4. In drug content determination (2.2.3.2), the methodology is not clear. Could the authors clarify, please? Were used a calibration curve with cotrimazole standard? The methodology was validated for the emulgels used ? What's the "n" used for this quantification? Explain. 5. In 2.2.3.4, in vitro release studies, the sink conditions was determined ? 6. The methodology used in 2.2.3.6. needs to be better explained; 7. The stability studies, 2.2.3.7., needs to be referenced; 8. In Table 3, the values of clotrimazole needs to be presented like medium/standard deviation (SD) of at least three replicates, then, this table needs to be revised; 9. Figure 2 needs to be revised, including SD and statistical analysis; 10. To conclude the magnitude of pseudoplastic behavior, the authors needs to apply Oswald-de-Waele equation; 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>11. To compare "in vitro drug release", the author need to validate the methology for quantification of clotrimazole, and is important to describe the composition of Canesten cream;</p> <p>12. To do a conclusion, the authors needs to present an statistical analysis of the data, then, I strongly suggest that "in vitro drug release" present the results revised after the statistical test;</p> <p>13. Figure 6 needs to be presented with medium/SD, followed by statistical test application. The same is true for table 5, table 6 and figure 7;</p> <p>14. The values observed and predicted, considering the information presented in the manuscript are identical. Very strange, were not ??? The table 7 was not correct according the results presented before.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>1. The manuscript presented two tables 5, please revise all text and do the corrections necessary; 2. Stability studies results were not presented;</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is very interesting; however, the scientific quality is not good.</p>	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer