SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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)

SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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	Abstract: What is "Âµg/mL"? Abstract: Is the wavelength 258 or 285 nm? References: The names of the authors and the name of the Journals should be standardized. Reference 17 should be corrected for ICH Q2R1. Figures 1 and 2 were drawn by the authors? What is the concentration of the solution in item 2.3.3? And about SOF? In item 2.3.4. SOF information is missing. The authors could overlap the chromatograms of Figures 4 and 5. Table 4 shows the results of intra-day precision. Where are the inter-day precision results? In the parameter accuracy, was the addition of the standard in the sample or placebo? Were the 2 standards added in the same solution? Table 5: Amount added (µg**/mL**) Amount recovered (µg**/mL**) Table 5: SOF concentrations are outside the range of linearity (125-375 µg/mL). 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. 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. 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. Table 8: Was the water-degradation done in which temperature and for how long? Was the degradation done with the 2 samples in the same solution? Do the degradation peaks from the water condition and the light condition have the same retention time?	
Minor REVISION comments	---	
Optional/General comments	---	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Ana Carolina Kogawa***
Department, University & Country	***Department of Pharmaceutics, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Araraquara, Brazil***