



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_48651
Title of the Manuscript:	Validated Stability Indicating HPTLC, UHPLC and UV-Spectrophotometric Techniques for the Determination of Bepotastine Besilate
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>)

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>Because of the lack of similar papers in the literature, the mentioned paper presents some scientific novelty. It could be interesting for pharmacists from the industry as well as for scientists working on APIs stability.</p> <p>The presented methods were properly projected and validated. However, some parts of the manuscript should be corrected to avoid some discrepancies.</p> <p>The two main problems to me are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -separation between the drug and its oxidative degradation product in HPTLC method -rather scarce information about MS analysis <p>Other:</p> <p>“Conclusion: Novel, simple and accurate method for the determination of bepotastine besilate in laboratory-prepared mixtures of bepotastine besilate with its oxidative degradate and in pharmaceutical formulations.”</p> <p>It sounds strange.</p> <p>“HPTLC method was applied over the concentration range of 0.5-5. µg/mL, while UHPLC method was linear over the concentration 2- 12 µg / band.”</p> <p>The units for concentration ranges seem to be wrong.</p> <p>“TLC plates used were 20 x 20 cm precoated with silicagel 60 F 254 (Flukachemie, Switzerland), a camag Linomate 5 sample applicator equipped with a 100 µL syringe (Hamilton, Germany) 20 x 20 cm twin through glass chamber (Camag).”</p> <p>The proper names should be given.</p> <p>Table 5: which reference, 5 or 6, is the proper one?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Densitogram of HPTLC was added mistake. It was a densitogram of first trials of separation and we added the correct one where there is no tailing present. The drug does not degradate upon treatment with H₂O₂ but it undergoes oxidation of both nitrogen atoms due to presence molecular ion peak (parent ion) at 581.45 m/z corresponding to its molecular weight. However when the vaporized drug passes into ionization chamber of mass spectrum it is bombarded by a stream of electrons which break it to smaller fragments. The base peak 163.18 m/z may be due to fragmentation of the parent ion to give the most stable ion at 163.18 m/z which has molecular formula C₉H₉O₂N. This fragmentation was illustrated in Scheme (2) where piperidine ring stabilize itself to more stable pyridine ring. “Conclusion: it was corrected to “The proposed three techniques are accurate and precise. They can be used for routine analysis of bepotastine besilate in pharmaceutical formulation and stability indicating methods”. The units for concentration ranges were a written mistake it was corrected to 0.5-5. µg / band, while UHPLC method was linear over the concentration 2- 12 µg/mL.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	It was not applicable