

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_85953
Title of the Manuscript:	Quality Assessment of Extemporaneously Compounded Carvedilol Oral Suspension for Pediatric Patients at the Hospital Pharmacy
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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	The article is very well written and refers an interesting issue for medical and pharmaceutical practice. Essentially, I have no significant remarks regarding the manuscript. Considering its merits, I highly recommend publishing the paper.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Citing of the sources within the text needs a major revision – some sources are not placed properly (ex., N 6,15,19 &amp; 21) and others are not cited at all (ex., 13,14,16, 17,18,20,25,26). Citing in the Reference list should be revised also according to the standards of the journal.</li><li>2. In practice, the paper is missing a discussion section. The authors should present their results first (in the results section) and to discuss them (in the discussion section). If any related previous investigations exist, what were their results compared to the current ones, are there any limitations, etc...</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. it has been revised.</li><li>2. In practice, the paper is missing a discussion section. The authors should present their results first (in the results section) and to discuss them (in the discussion section). the results and discussion sections were combined so the reader would not have to go back to the results section to correlate the discussion. Also, because the results make little sense to most readers without interpretation. Also, according to the journal standard the results and discussion sections could be combined. If any related previous investigations exist, what were their results compared to the current ones, It has been included and highlighted in yellow. are there any limitations, etc... It has been included and highlighted in yellow.</li></ol>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Paper quality analysis: Conceptual framework- Excellent Significance of review- Very good Finding and methodology- Very good Result & discussion - Good	

### **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>	