Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_46503**
Title of the Manuscript:	**UV-SPECTROPHOTOMETRIC AND FIRST-ORDER DERIVATIVE METHODS SIMULTANEOUS DETERMINATION OF PARACETAMOL, IBUPROFEN, AND CAFFEINE IN BULK AND CAPSULES**
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	**Abstract** "the methods use ethanol 90%: 0.1 N sodium hydroxide (25:75) as a solvent for analysis work". Please, delete work at the end of the sentence. It reads better without the "work". **Introduction** Line 39-41 is not very clear. The argument was started in the previous paragraph and the new paragraph starting with moreover makes it difficult to follow. I suggest they are joined (the two paragraphs). Line 39: the introduction does not show any work on the simultaneous determination of these compounds so what does the authors mean by "there are limited works" **Methods** Line 60-61: what are the bases for selecting Ethanol 90 % and 0.1 M NaOH (25:75) as a solvent for developing spectral characteristics of drugs Line 64 and 66 The authors need to give a little background to NO Pain® Capsules Line 77: the precise amount use should be stated and not estimated amount Line 93 should read "**2.5 Procedure for Pharmaceutical Preparation and spectroscopic analyses** **Results and discussion** Line 111: there is no evidence or reference figure to support the selection of the λ max. Incomplete table under section 3.3 **Conclusion** The determination mentioned should be qualified as concentration determination. The results do not clearly point out the conclusions made.	Correction done in yellow highlights Corrected Revision done in the manuscript Information added Corrected We have tried to modify the manuscript by considering these valuable comments
Minor REVISION comments	The authors need to review literature on the chemometric analysis for simultaneous determination of the three drugs in pharmaceutical dosage forms. This review should be used to improve the introduction and discussion.	
Optional/General comments	That abstract was good and summarizes the study The aim of the study was well spelt out. There are a number of typographical errors that need to be fixed. There is no novelty in the study, the determination of concentration using UV spectroscopy and maximum wave lengths for the 3 compounds are not novel. It will be helpful if the authors can clearly state the novelty of the study. The paper is focused on the determination of the concentrations of the 3 compounds. There are no controls or standards for accurate comparisons.	Typographical error has been corrected Revised thoroghly

PART 2:

	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)*	