Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
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

	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	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. "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? "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.	
Minor REVISION comments	"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 "or its size must be lowered to a small scale" please define "small scale." Please use abbreviation at the first instance - mementime term is in the introduction abbreviation in materials Please use abbreviation at the first instance of Lactoferrin Please use full name at the first instance of TEM "The results of in vitro release investigation done at a temperature of 37oC in PBS pH 7.4." something is missing in this sentence "MEM was releases" – correct the grammar 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. Please correct the grammar of the paper.	
Optional/General comments	The results reported in the manuscript are interesting and worth to be published. However, the section on results and discussion must be redone. The best approach would be to make two separate sections: results and discussion. As stated in the compulsory section – more results should be presented as a graph or table to substantiate the statements made in the manuscript.	

	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:	Ryszard Tomasiuk
Department, University & Country	Kazimierz Pulaski University of Technology and Humanities Radom, Poland