



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_47236
Title of the Manuscript:	Method validation for determination of metformin hydrochloride in pharmaceutical formulations by capillary electrophoresis with capacitively coupled contactless conductivity detection
Type of the Article	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Line 53 term "Optimized" should be deleted (if NOT then justify why?) Line 104 specify ultrasonic water bath model and manufacturer Line 110 specify brand name with manufacturer. 111 why 1000 mL dissolution media was taken? Coding for product A, B & C is very confusing so it should be specified first whether that are immediate release or SR/CR dosage form. "Min" should be replaced by "m". Method validation should be discussed in methodology . Methodology section should be revised as it is not in contrast of result and discussion section. Line 119 'Optimization of C⁴D and instrumental conditions" should be revised because without discussion of method developed how could anyone OPTIMIZE the work. Under methodology pH of dissolution media is 6.8 while in methodology it is 6.1. Line 160 why did you mention only 2 values for LOD and LOQ (0.049 and 0.15 µg mL⁻¹, respectively) whether testing is being done for 3 products. Figure and table numbers cited in text are mismatched. Why references added in introduction sections to increase their number check line no. 38, 44 & 51 absorption [7-18], MS detection [4, 20-25] etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Optimized word has been deleted. The ultrasonic water bath model and manufacturer have been specified. Please refer to page 5 line 111. The brand name and manufacturer have been specified. Please refer to page 5 line 117-119. 1000 mL dissolution media was taken according to the specified method in the United States Pharmacopeia (USP). The coding for products A, B and C has been specified. Please refer to page 5 line 117. Min has been replaced by m. For the method validation can't be in the methodology because we performed the validation after the optimization of C⁴D and instrumental conditions, moreover the validation must be in the results and discussion section due to we discuss the results that we got in the method validation (e.g., Linearity, Limits of detection and quantitation, etc.). We already discuss the Optimization of C⁴D and instrumental conditions. please refer to page 6-7 line 129-155. The actual value of pH of background electrolyte (BGE) after optimization is 6.8 and not 6.1. It already mentioned in optimization of C⁴D and instrumental conditions section. Please refer to page 6 line 130-135. The values of LOD and LOQ that mentioned in method validation only for the standard, not for the real samples. I revised the manuscript I didn't find any mismatching in the figure and table numbers. Actually, we cited these references in term of comparison of our work with the previously reported methods not for increase the reference numbers.
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Line 10 Is "i.d." standard abbreviation? Line 23 revise the sentence. Line 56 sentence should be reframed. Line 103 & 104 should be reframed. Check figure no. cited in the text. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, it is a standard abbreviation (i.d means Inner Diameter of CE column) There is mismatching between the lines no that you asked and what I have in the manuscript so if possible could you please specify the sentence that needs to revise or reframe. The figure no. have been checked.
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	