



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 (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	1. The main goal of the study was to develop a faster method compared to all, below 3 minutes. This goal was not proved because some similar methods in the literature exists, e.g.: DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF A RAPID STABILITY INDICATING CHROMATOGRAPHIC DETERMINATION OF CEFDINIR IN BULK POWDER AND DOSAGE FORM USING MONOLITHIC STATIONARY PHASE Hisham Hashem, Ayman A. Gouda & Wafaa Hassan Journal of Liquid Chromatography & Related Technologies, 35:12, 1638-1648 The retention time for cefdinir was then 2,183 min! This work was not cited by the Authors, why? 2. The optimization of the mobile phase composition needs explanation. For the developing study, the changes were low 82:18 and 85:15, for the robustness study they were very high, e.g. 75:25 and 85:15. I do not understand this.	1. Our purpose for developing a rapid and user friendly method was quite successful. Due to oversight, we have missed to quote the article of Hisham Hashem et al., which has now been incorporated. We have developed a method where cefdinir elutes at ~ 2.9 min at room temperature (~27°C), whereas the cited article shows the elution at ~2.2 min at high temperature (40°C). Though the retention time is marginally less, but our method is more user friendly, being a rapid method. 2. We have done various trials with respect to mobile phase composition and the actual data obtained has been presented in this article. Once the ratio of the mobile phase (80:20) was fixed, then stage wise, pH and flow rate were also optimised. Ultimately the method was qualified for robustness parameter as per the regulatory guidelines / practices and it has



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3. Also, the data in Tables 4 and 5, are not clear, what about the retention time values? 4. The pH 2.5 of mobile phase was selected for the experimental work. What about stability of cefdinir. Any information in this area was not included. 5. Linearity study should be extended, e. g. the residuals analysis should be performed. 6. Precision of the method was not proved, the results for the system precision was only included.	demonstrated very well. 3. Retention time has been incorporated in the table as suggested. 4. It seems to be stable as the % RSD are well within the acceptable range and no any secondary peaks are visible during various experiments. 5. It is not required as we are not targeting the residual analysis. 6. It is a very good suggestion but not so important. It will be taken care of in the next articles.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		