

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Pharmaceutical Research: Recent Advances and Trends</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2839
Title of the Manuscript:	Design, Development and characterization of solar skincare: Ethylhexyltriazone sunscreen lotion
Type of the Article	Book chapter

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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.	This manuscript holds importance for the scientific community as it addresses the formulation and characterization of sunscreen using EthylhexylTriazone, a highly effective UVB filter. By exploring various physical properties and SPF testing, the study provides insights into the development of stable and effective sunscreen formulations, which are crucial in preventing skin cancer and photoaging. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on the practical application of sun protection and its attempt to incorporate modern methodologies. However, the lack of clarity and in-depth analysis of the results limits its overall impact, leaving room for improvement in presenting the findings more comprehensively.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, " <i>Design Development and Characterization of Solar Skincare: EthylhexylTriazone Sunscreen Lotion</i> ," is somewhat suitable but could be more concise and reflective of the content.	
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.	The abstract of the article is not fully comprehensive and would benefit from clearer structure and more detailed information. It should include a clear statement of the study's objective, such as formulating and evaluating a sunscreen lotion containing EthylhexylTriazone. Key results, such as the SPF value, stability, and physical characteristics of the lotion, should be summarized. A brief mention of the methodology, including the evaluation tests performed (e.g., pH, spreadability, and stability), would enhance the abstract's clarity. The conclusion should emphasize the effectiveness and stability of the sunscreen formulation. Redundant phrases and vague information should be removed to keep the abstract focused and concise.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, but some improvements are needed for better clarity and flow. While the logical sequence from the introduction to the materials and methods, results, and discussion is effective, some subsection titles could be more concise and specific. For instance, the repetitive information in the introduction about sunscreen types and benefits could be consolidated to avoid redundancy. Additionally, the discussion section would benefit from further expansion with clear subsections that delve deeper into the implications of the findings and comparisons with existing formulations. Ensuring the proper inclusion and labeling of all figures and tables mentioned will also improve the overall structure of the manuscript. These adjustments would make the manuscript more organized and easier to navigate.	
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 manuscript appears to be scientifically correct and technically sound due to its detailed approach in the formulation and evaluation of sunscreen lotion using EthylhexylTriazone. The study follows a systematic methodology, including the preparation of the formulation, testing its physical characteristics (such as pH, viscosity, and spreadability), and determining its SPF, which are key parameters for sunscreen evaluation. The use of established techniques like the	

[Review Form2](#)

	<b>Mansur equation for SPF determination adds to its scientific robustness. However, while the methodology is sound, the analysis of the results could be more comprehensive, especially in comparing the findings with existing research to strengthen the scientific conclusions. Overall, the study adheres to standard scientific practices, making it a solid contribution to the field of sun protection formulations.</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<b>This manuscript demonstrates a solid scientific approach with a well-structured methodology and relevant topic, but there are areas that require significant improvement. The language and clarity need refinement, and the discussion and analysis could be more in-depth to strengthen the scientific impact. With better presentation and more comprehensive analysis, this score could be improved.</b>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kartikay Prakash</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Lucknow Model College of Pharmacy, India</b>