

Review Form2

Book Name:	Pharmaceutical Research: Recent Advances and Trends
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2346
Title of the Manuscript:	Advanced Drug Delivery Systems: Innovations and Applications in Modern Pharmacy
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Yes, It is an interesting and up-to-date topic. overall, It is an useful article. I have announced my comments below.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The “title” of the article is interesting and appropriate.	
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 comprehensive and complete, but in my opinion, it is better to delete the following part. Passive targeting, primarily through the Enhanced Permeability and Retention (EPR) effect, allows nanoparticles and liposomes to accumulate preferentially at tumor sites. Active targeting further enhances specificity by using ligands to bind to specific cellular receptors, exemplified by HER2-targeted nanoparticles. Stimuli-responsive delivery systems, which react to environmental changes such as pH, temperature, enzymes, and light, provide precise control over drug release, with notable examples including pH-responsive hydrogels and temperature-sensitive liposomes. It is also better to use one of the sentencesbecause both are almost they express a concept. "challenges of these advanced drug delivery systems" or "Furthermore, it addresses the current limitations and future directions of research in this field, emphasizing the need for interdisciplinary collaboration to overcome obstacles and develop innovative solutions" In general, it will be better if it is modified a little and the repetition is less.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The "Introduction" is very brief and short.According to the abstract, it is expected to be very complete and accurate, but it is not.The contents are very general and very concise.No research background has been used.The topic of the work is very broad, it includes many subjects and topics.Certainly, many studies and researches have been conducted and each of them have obtained results, none of which have been mentioned here. I suggest you use the studies and experiences of other researchers and bring them here.Then tell about your work and mention the difference between your work and other researches and explain the importance of your work. If this chapter is the beginning, it is better to state in the article that each part will be discussed in more detail in the next chapters.Otherwise, examples should be given in the form of figures or tables for each part. The design of structures is mentioned in the abstract of the article, but it is not discussed in the article. The section of challenges and limitations as well as future directions is only mentioned in detail. The number of sections and subsections is very high, which has made the article unclear and	

Review Form2

	the continuity of the content is not appropriate. The quality of the figures and charts is not interesting and should be corrected.	
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 idea and topic of the article is interesting. It is better to change the article's writing. In general, by reading more articles, the author is familiar with the ideas and thoughts and writing style of more researchers, and this is very effective.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	According to the previous section, the resources are insufficient. I think more articles should be read.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The sentences seem simple and basic. It is better to change the article's writing.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Saeideh Hosseini
Department, University & Country	Iran