



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_67339
Title of the Manuscript:	Orodispersible films as a solution to drug acceptability issues: a short review
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: 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	<p>The headings of this review look like research article rather than review. I have never seen any review article that describe the details of their literature search. In my opinion, 4 articles are insufficient to draw any conclusion. I use the key words "Orodispersible film" and "Acceptability" and found more than 10 articles that related to these key words</p> <p>What is STAMP study? Page 3 line 51</p> <p>The evidence of geriatric acceptability is unclear. Could you provide more evidence?</p> <p>In the discussion, author mention that "from neonates to 70 years old adults" but in the table 1 the oldest volunteer age is only 60.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Page 3 line 58 Typo "stud"</p> <p>The journal name of Ref No. 12, 17 and 20 should be in the abbreviation form.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>In my opinion, the scope of this review is too narrow. It will be difficult to choose for citation.</p> <p>The authors should review about techniques of producing Orodispersible films. For Example electrospinning, film casting and 3D printing which method produce acceptable films</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	<i>Pratchaya Tipduangta</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Chiang Mai University, Thailand</i>