SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_46807
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and validation of HPLC method for the determination and quantification of colchicine in Gloriosa superba
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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 highlight that part in the manu his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. In the section 2.3. and 2.4. I suggest that the authors join these items (only 2.3.) and in item 2.4. put only the method validation item.	
	2. In the results, is it possible for the authors to put the chromatograms on the same time scale? For example, the standard chromatogram is 0 - 10 minutes and the plant chromatogram is 0-15 minutes.	
Minor REVISION comments	 Section "2.1. Standard, Solvents and Reagents" put the purity of the colchicine standard. Section "2.2" is necessary a name for the item, for example: Sample Preparation. What year the plant material was collected? The plant material has voucher specimen number? In the linearity and range methods describe which concentrations were used. Check the references. Different styles. English revision need mainly in the results and discussion. Grammatical errors should check in the manuscript. 	
Optional/General comments	I found the manuscript interesting and complete. Analytical validations are important for the identification and quantification of compounds in plants.	

PART 2:

		Author's comment (if agreed with
		that part in the manuscript. It is ma
		feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bruno dos S. Lima
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Sergipe Campus São Cristóvão, Brazil

ed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and nuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write

vith reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight mandatory that authors should write his/her