

Review Form2

Book Name:	Pharmaceutical Research: Recent Advances and Trends
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2489
Title of the Manuscript:	VESICULAR NANOCARRIERS IN TRANSDERMAL DRUG DELIVERY
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is providing the basic content where the entry level can researchers can use this as hand book for vesiclular drug delivery systems and might be a good book for students of pharmaceutical sciences and if characterization is given that would be great bench for all the researchers	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is recommended	
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.	Given as comments in the section abstract	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The flow of subject in the manuscript is good	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Scientifically eligilbel and technicqally advances	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language should edited for grammatical errors and punctuation marks and other than this it is easy to understand for the beginners	
Optional/General comments	Overall the article is good and authors is recommended revise the document with suggested shnagesand if charecterization is added to the draft it sounds more profient for bench scientists	

Review Form2

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pola Kranthi Kumar
Department, University & Country	Nizam Institute of Pharamcy, India