

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_88534
Title of the Manuscript:	Polyethylene glycol conjugation for solubility enhancement of Cefadroxil, a poorly soluble antibiotic
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>English language needs improvement</li><li>Change in font size in Abstract</li><li>The structure of Cefadroxil drawn in wrong, no amide group is seen Heterocyclic ring NH-C=O should be there instead of OH.</li><li>Use of factorial design should have been done in preparation of formulation instead of preparing 7 formulations at random.</li><li>What was the rational behind using PEG 6000 in 0.5, 1, 2,3,4,</li><li>No SNH group is present . The structural elucidation is done wrong. In abstract it is being mentioned as reaction of PEG6000 occur with <b>amide</b> while in interpretation of IR values it is mentioned as <b>amine</b>.</li><li><b>No mention of how UV has been done for determining solubility enhancement has been done.</b></li><li><b>A formation of micelles of PEG has taken place and drug seems to be entrapped in micelles hence no peaks of drug structures are observed in IR of conjugates.</b></li><li><b>Scientific reasoning is poor and need more proper scientific content</b></li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>English language Checked.</li><li>Font size is maintained 12 in abstract as per guidelines</li><li>Correct structure of cefadroxil is represented.</li><li>We have done as this present method is also acceptable</li><li>Based on literature reports these ratios were selectd.</li><li>SNH is not there. Correction is made in interpretation as aminde.</li><li><b>Mentioned using UV-Visible spectrophotometer</b> (Shimadzu, JAPAN) at <math>\lambda_{\max}</math> of 264nm.</li><li>Reasoning given</li><li>Reasoning given</li></ul>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	