



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_50076
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Amlodipine Besilate and Azilsartan Medoxomil by UHPLC, HPTLC and Spectrophotometric techniques
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>) Author stated the methods were validated as per ICH, but the method validation is missing many parameters</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Specificity of method</li> <li>2) Forced degradation of method</li> <li>3) Solution stability</li> <li>4) Mobile phase stability</li> <li>5) Ruggedness study ( on different day, different system and different analyst)</li> <li>6) Filter study</li> <li>7) Robust ness (wrt to Flow , temperatue, mobile phase compositions and sample preparation parameters)</li> </ol> <p>2) As per ICH guidance all the assay quantification methbods are stability indicating, but the developed HPTLC and Spectrophotometric techneques are not stability indicating.</p> <p>3) Accuracy is proved at 100% concentration only, but as per ICH it should cover minimum at 80% and maximum 120%</p> <p>4) Range of the experiments is also not established.</p> <p>5) The manuscript is missing the development part of these 3 methods</p> <p>Overall the study is not upto the mark and manuscript can be accepted after addressing the above comment</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>D.V.Subba Rao</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>USA</b>