

Review of: "[Review Article] Nanocarriers for Protein and Peptide Drug Delivery"

Priyanka Choudhury¹

1 Medical College of Wisconsin

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

- 1. This review is very vague and a generalized discussion. There is no mention of any recent interesting findings that are helpful. Referencing of the tables is also not proper. I would suggest authors to think to reconstruct the manuscript and include cutting-edge exciting newer findings in this area.
- 2. Table 1 does not have any references.

Roy, A., Nishchaya, K., & Rai, V. K. (2022). Nanoemulsion-based dosage forms for the transdermal drug delivery applications: A review of recent advances. Expert Opinion on Drug Delivery, 19(3), 303-319. https://doi.org/10.1080/17425247.2022.2045944.

Also, this review doesn't have this table. Authors need to mention the source of information they are taking in a more constructive way.

- 1. There are problems with the discussion that they have provided for the nanomaterials. The authors mentioned improper pieces of information in many sections, the acceptable size of the microsphere is 1 to 1000 micrometers, and the diameter of a nanoparticle is 1-100 nm, not 1-150 nm as mentioned by the authors.
- 2. A review should focus on the importance and novelty of the technology or the science they are considering. This manuscript does not convey that.
- 3. Since the aim of the review is to explore the nanocarriers that have the potential to overcome the limitations associated with protein and peptide drug delivery, it would be better to introduce the potential drawbacks of protein and peptide drug delivery in the introduction.