



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_45849
Title of the Manuscript:	HPLC, densitometric and spectrophotometric methods for the simultaneous determination of colchicine and probenecid in their binary mixture
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The text should remain consistent. It should be prepared according to the requirements set by the publishing house. 2. A lot of mistakes were found in the text: omitted letters, unnecessary use of parentheses, eg Table (1), Figure (5a, 5b). 3. Rewrite conclusions. They are too laconic now. 4. Line 31 – "Upon using" - the end of the sentence is incomprehensible. 5. Figure 6a – indicate clearly which spectrum is for probenecid and which is for colchicine. 6. Line 93 – "Good linearity...." – the sentence is not clear, rewrite it. 7. Line 110, section "Selectivity" – insert units. 8. Table 3 – change the title and indicate what it exactly presents. The legend is needed. 9. Table 4 – what means (43)? If it is citation should be in square brackets. Moreover the number of citation is wrong, the list of references ends with the number [34]. Is this table consist of two parts or there are two tables concerning particular drug? 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The subject of the publication is valuable and shows the large contribution of the authors' work. I suggest accept the manuscript after Compulsory revision.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Katarzyna Bober</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland</i>