



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_40460
Title of the Manuscript:	A Novel Stress Indicating RP-HPLC Method Development and Validation for the Simultaneous Estimation of Velpatasvir and Sofosbuvir in bulk and its Tablet Dosage Form
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract: What is "Åµg/mL"?</p> <p>Abstract: Is the wavelength 258 or 285 nm?</p> <p>References: The names of the authors and the name of the Journals should be standardized.</p> <p>Reference 17 should be corrected for ICH Q2R1.</p> <p>Figures 1 and 2 were drawn by the authors?</p> <p>What is the concentration of the solution in item 2.3.3? And about SOF?</p> <p>In item 2.3.4. SOF information is missing.</p> <p>The authors could overlap the chromatograms of Figures 4 and 5.</p> <p>Table 4 shows the results of intra-day precision. Where are the inter-day precision results?</p> <p>In the parameter accuracy, was the addition of the standard in the sample or placebo?</p> <p>Were the 2 standards added in the same solution?</p> <p>Table 5: Amount added (µg/mL) Amount recovered (µg/mL)</p> <p>Table 5: SOF concentrations are outside the range of linearity (125-375 µg/mL).</p> <p>The robustness should evaluate the results of the modification against the results of the normal condition. The authors show the results of the modification without comparing with the results of the normal condition.</p> <p>The title of the work should be: "A Novel Stress Indicating RP-HPLC Method Development and Validation for the Simultaneous Estimation of Velpatasvir and Sofosbuvir in Tablet Dosage Form", because the authors quantified VEL and SOF in the tablets and not in the bulk.</p> <p>Was the dosing done using 1 solution with the 2 active? This is important because each has its own adjuvants and this can interfere with the quantification of the active.</p> <p>Table 8: Was the water-degradation done in which temperature and for how long?</p> <p>Was the degradation done with the 2 samples in the same solution?</p> <p>Do the degradation peaks from the water condition and the light condition have the same retention time?</p>	<p>1. Typographical mistake and corrected as µg/ml</p> <p>2. Typographical Mistake and corrected as 285nm</p> <p>3. corrected and submitted.</p> <p>4. Typographical mistake and corrected.</p> <p>5. Yes ,through chemdraw</p> <p>6. yes corrected concentrations of VEL and SOF</p> <p>7. Both are separated and sample chromatogram showed in line 156</p> <p>8. The addition of the standard into sample.</p> <p>9. I performed system precision and method precision</p> <p>10. Yes standard spiked into sample</p> <p>11. yes amount added and amount recovered µg/ml.</p> <p>12. SOF concentration within the linearity. (Linearity got in this concentration range 125 -375µg/ml.)</p> <p>13. Typographical mistake, the values entered into tables and change the parameters, temparatue ±5⁰C, flow rate± 0.2 mL/min, Mobile phase ± 3mL variation were taken.</p> <p>14. corrected as bulk and its tablet dosage form.</p> <p>15. There was no interference between active moieties.</p> <p>16. Water degradation carried at 60⁰C.</p> <p>17. Yes both were showed similar degradation peaks</p>
Minor REVISION comments	---	
Optional/General comments	---	