

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_86090
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT, CHARACTERIZATION AND IN VITRO EVALUATION OF LACTOFERRIN CONJUGATED AND MEMANTINE LOADED PEG-PLGA NANOPARTICLES FOR THE TREATMENT OF ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE
Type of the Article	Research

**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>)

## Review Form 1.6

### **PART 1:** Review Comments

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>In order to compare the two curves presented in Figure 2 please superimpose on both curves 95% confidence interval. In case of overlapping confidence intervals there is lack of statistically significant differences between those curves.</p> <p>"The uptake of Lf conjugate PEG-PLGA NPs by bEnd.3 cells was higher than the uptake of PEG-PLGA NPs. The uptake of Lf conjugate PEG-PLGA NPs increased with increase in the concentration." – where are results (table or graph) related to those statements?</p> <p>"significantly higher than PEG-PLGA NPs formulation. After presaturation with free Lf, the fluorescence intensity of cells incubated with Lf conjugate PEG-PLGA NPs formulation was reduced, indicating that the decreased cellular uptake of Lf conjugate PEG-PLGA NPs formulation was due to free Lf binding competitively to receptors on bEnd.3 cells, further confirming Lf targeting effect on bEnd.3 cells via receptor mediated endocytosis. " – please provide a graph or table of those results.</p>	Revised
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>"Because of the blood-brain barrier, AD and other neurodegenerative diseases are difficult to treat (BBB)" – please put BBB abbreviation after blood-brain barrier not at the end of the sentence</p> <p>"or its size must be lowered to a small scale" please define "small scale."</p> <p>Please use abbreviation at the first instance - mementime term is in the introduction abbreviation in materials</p> <p>Please use abbreviation at the first instance of Lactoferrin</p> <p>Please use full name at the first instance of TEM</p> <p>"The results of in vitro release investigation done at a temperature of 37oC in PBS pH 7.4." something is missing in this sentence</p> <p>"MEM was releases" – correct the grammar</p> <p>The sentence "As a model for the BBB, bEnd.3 cells are a good...." – please provide the references for the statements made in this sentence.</p> <p>Please correct the grammar of the paper.</p>	Noted
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>The results reported in the manuscript are interesting and worth to be published. However, the section on results and discussion must be redone.</p> <p>The best approach would be to make two separate sections: results and discussion.</p> <p>As stated in the compulsory section – more results should be presented as a graph or table to substantiate the statements made in the manuscript.</p>	

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