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Reviewer’s report:

Title#Pharmaceutical quality of seven generic Levodopa/Benserazide products compared with original Madopar(R) / Prolopa(R) by Urs E. Gasser et al.

The article by Urs E. Gasser et al reports on the comparison of the pharmaceutical quality of generic Madopar versus branded in order to investigate the potential interchangeability by the intrinsic properties of the pharmaceutical products. This is an important topic for the clinicians.

Generally, this paper can be acceptable. However, there are some questions remained to be modified as follows:

Discretionary Revisions

No revision

Minor Essential Revisions

• Line 12, page 9: The term “..excluded ..” should be corrected.

Major Compulsory Revisions

• Introduction. Pharmaceutical equivalents mean that the several drugs have the same active ingredients, are of the same dosage form, route of administration and are identical in strength or concentration. However, clinicians are aware that even small variation of L-Dopa availability can induce the development of motor complication in the advanced stage of Parkinson’s disease. Thus, any risk factors, provoking these motor and non-motor complications, should be stressed. In this view, a few sentences should be added to better understand the consequences of variation of L-Dopa bioavailability in the clinical ground.

• Conclusion. The conclusion paragraph should be rewritten in a more organized way. Specifically, on the basis of their results, the authors should suggest the right way or propose a model to reduce these differences among products.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.