



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_ACSj_12275
Title of the Manuscript:	RP-HPLC ANALYTICAL METHOD DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION FOR ESTIMATION OF THE DRUG CEFDINIR USING TINIDAZOLE AS INTERNAL STANDARD IN BULK AND PHARMACEUTICAL DOSAGE FORMS
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 '**l a c k o f N o v e l t y**', 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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1-In the aim the author write that is to develop faster retention time : Please mention the retention time in the literature 2-The method is applied for single component in presence of tinidazole ,why the author didn't try to check the stability of the drug to apply the method as stability indicating method 3-The author use internal standard and the method didn't apply in plasma or biological fluids The internal standard used to cancel error during sample preparation which is common in the biological fluids preparation. 4-Check the text , there is several spelling mistakes 5-Why the area didn't represent as relative peak area : peak area of drug /peak area of tinidazole to cancel systematic error	1. The abstract has been revised. 2. Our aim is not related to stability indicating method. We wish to provide a good, user friendly method for the determination of Cefdinir by using Tinidazole as internal standard. We are happy that we have been able to do so. 3. It is a good suggestion. We will try to consider this in the next article. 4. It has been checked and corrected. 5. It will be taken care of in future articles. It is a good idea
<u>Minor REVISION comments</u>		
<u>Optional/General comments</u>		