



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>)



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>1- Title should be modified to be " Validated Stability Indicating HPTLC, UHPLC and UV-Spectrophotometric Techniques for the Determination of Bepotastine Besilate in presence of its oxidative degradate . to be distinctive your work</p> <p>2- Introduction is too short , please add more details Bepotastine besilate (Bepotastine-B) (its chemical structure is demonstrated in scheme 1) add it please Including RP-HPLC techniques [3-5] ; among these methods is method of LC-MS/MS one [reference 5] discusses it in details ; and also and stability indicating HPTLC determination of Bepotastine-B in presence of its acid degradate [6], discuss it in details because you choose it as reference method</p> <p>3- Experimental; add (twon , country) for each instrument and chemicals , like , USA ; RAMEDA CO, (..... , Egypt); , UK</p> <p>4- Preparation of degradation product; why you did not try 30 % H2O2 to reduce waiting time (2 days is too long time)?however, your method of preparation of oxidative degradate is very wonderful where no standard was available</p> <p>5- In 2.3.1 linearity , why you choose 266 nm in HPTLC and 260 nm in UPLC method , I think it should be the same detection wavelength</p> <p>6- In TLC method , it is very clear that normol TLC was not suitable for the drug because of very clear tailing ; why you did not try RP-TLC , however you can add it to future research plane to improve peak shape and reduce tailing .</p> <p>7- In results and discussion ; check the mass spectrum of oxidative degradate , you will found very clear peak at 163.18 m/z , give explanation please</p> <p>8- 1.3 application to pharmaceutical formulations (remove s in all manuscript please one tablet dosage form) , while UV-spectrophotometric methods are more simple , this is not true because it does not include direct measurement in zero order . you can say that UV spectrophotometer is cheap and easily available instrument</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>9- Add future research plane after discussion; like application of the methods for determination of the drug in presence of acid degradates , alkaline degradates and photo degradation products</p>	
Optional/General comments	No 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohamed Gamal Mahmoud
Department, University & Country	Jouf university , Saudi Arabia