



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 '**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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1- Please justify the very short retention time of the internal standard 2- Please specify the total run time 3- Linearity is not done for the internal standard it rather should be kept constant throughout the experiment ; <u>please explain</u> 4- Please explain the way you do the accuracy test cant you do it directly on the prepared samples of known concentration without spiking? why are you adopting a method close to standard addition while you should not have a matrix effect	1. As the short retention time of the Internal standard do not have any interference with any other peak and moreover the method is delivering consistent result. Therefore, we feel that there is not any drawback of short retention time. It is rather an advantage. 2. Now it is mentioned in the method. (Page No.6, section 2.8) 3. You are correct, but we wanted to check the trend of internal standard also. That is why we have done so. 4. No. It cannot be done. For demonstrating accuracy, spiking with known concentration is necessary. Regarding your suggestion for “close to standard addition” it will be taken care in the forthcoming articles. Now, it is not possible please.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1- Use of Capital letters should be monitored	1. It is monitored and taken care.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2- The grammar should be revised 3- Figure 3 (80:20) should be replaced by a better figure 4- Similarly for figure 4 in case of PH 3.5 and 4.5 Generally provide figure showing the complete peak of cefdinir 5- material, reagents and equipments should come first before chromatographic separation and optimization 6- Indicate the unit of concentration of calibration curve	2. The whole article is checked for grammar mistakes and corrected. 3. The figures have been changed with a better one. 4. The figures have been changed with a better one. 5. The change has been done in the article. 6. It has been mentioned in the figure 9.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please refer to the PDF for additional comments and correction	This has been taken care of and the necessary corrections are done.