



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/ OR/ 2442
Title of the Manuscript:	Formulation and physical characterization of a novel sustained-release ophthalmic delivery system for sparfloxacin: the effect of the biological environment

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 9 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 (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	This sustained release formulation and its characterization using tear fluid release kinetics is a good piece of work in the formulation characterization in pharmaceuticals. As it has not been proved in <i>in vivo</i> experimental condition, I am not finding that the sustained effect is proved for making it interesting for ophthalmologists, and scientists. I am strongly advising the authors to conduct an <i>in vivo</i> transcorneal penetration study or tear film kinetic study atleast in rabbits to prove their hypothesis. -The main problem in ocular sustained release formulations in the form of nano delivery system is the impact of precorneal factors including pH and non specific irritation, reflux tearfilm and subsequent drug or drug formulation removal from precorneal area. Simulated tearfilm release kinetics can not mimic the <i>in vivo</i> effect as our personnel experience working with these kind formulations showed a poor correlation between IVIVC. -If the authors wish to publish only the formulation part, they better opt for any pharmaceuticals journal for catering the interest of formulation scientists. Other comments	This paper including only formulation and physical evaluation. Ex-vivo study has been conducted using pigs eyes, and intended to be published in another paper. Yes, I agree with you. But at least it gives an indication about the differences between the formulations before go forward to <i>in vivo</i> study.

	In the manuscript, I failed the method used for the quantification of sparfloxacin from formulation as well well in its release kinetics. Page 8 discuss about quantification of piroxicam by spectrophotometer- unable to know its relevance to this study.	This paper including only (as indicated in the title), the formulation and physical characterization, and effect of biological environment. There are other parts including in vitro release using different methods, release kinetics and ex-vivo study that will be submitted as soon as possible . Those could not be included in only one paper, as it will be very long. It was wrong and deleted
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		