

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Pharmaceutical Research: Recent Advances and Trends
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2531
Title of the Manuscript:	An Insight into Preparatory Methods and Characterization of Orodispersible Film—A Review
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript clearly explained about the ODFs previous work, their significance in for dysphagic patients, about the methods of preparations and evaluation of ODFs. I like the way of representing the manuscript and the synchronization in between the paragraphs and an upto date data on ODFs has been clearly represented. Especially the table 1 representing the marketed products of ODFs and Table 2 about the patents highlight the manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The author didn't represented the reference for section 3.2. in section 4.1 the author mentioned about drugs BCS class 2 and 3 drugs are suitable but the class 4 drugs are highly suitable as their disintegration is less than 30 sec. the author has to give clarity regarding this. In evaluation the author briefed his discussion but didnt mentioned the optimum range of any evaluation for ideal ODFs of various types. The author can mention all these as a lot of work has been already done on ODFs. 6.8.1, 6.8.2, 6.8.3	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	

[Review Form2](#)

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes with minor revision	
Optional/General comments	In overall the manuscript is good and can be accepted Overall the manuscript is good	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sudhir Maddela
Department, University & Country	USA