



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 (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	I believe that the work presented by the authors is interesting and could be published. However, in my opinion, the work must be corrected as there are countless types one would expect to be minimal at this stage of correction. As example only on the first page, there are around 7 mistakes of this kind which are increasing on subsequent pages. This removes him merits to work since apparently the authors do not take very seriously this kind of details that I think are important.	
Minor REVISION comments	As previously mentioned, the work must be inspected by the authors since the number of typographical errors is significant and list them all is complex. Just as example on page 1 line 6 is cellulose2910, it should be changed by cellulose 2910; line 12 (Y2) were chosen change by (Y2) were chosen; line 13 properties,pH change for, properties pH, line 19 HPMC 2910as, change for HPMC 2910 as, line 22 in keywords Emulgel,multifactorial design change for Emulgel, multifactorial design, line 29 of stable emulsionby, change for stable emulsion by, line 30 as vehiclesto, for vehicles to change. These errors continue and even increase in the preceding pages, which undoubtedly shows little seriousness by the authors of the work.	
Optional/General comments	The work is interesting but requires a thorough review by the authors.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer