



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_22675
Title of the Manuscript:	Pharmacopoeial Standards and Specifications for Pharmaceutical Oral Liquid Preparations
Type of the Article	Review papers

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 <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	Item 2.5 – This item should be described with more details Item 2.7 – The definition of emulsion should be improved Item 3 – Add the reference of the phrase on line 140 line Item 4.1- The phrases on lines 170 and 176 contain similar information Item 4.3 - What is the importance of this assay? Know the exact amount of drugs and ensure the biological effect Discuss the main differences of Pharmacopoeias for the tests as it was done in item 4.4 Item 4.6 - Uniformity of dose can be done by mass variation or content uniformity. Explain this better Item 5 – the authors should describe if there is a harmonization of the requirements of oral liquid quality control in the main Pharmacopoeias	2.5 – Done 2.7 – Done 3 – Actually this line is written based on the opinion of the pharmacists directly related with production. Infect authors are also pharmacists. 4.1 – Merging is done 4.3 –General information is given, for this reason reference is not given. There are diverse types of oral liquid, for this reason it is not possible to show exact amount of drugs. 4.4 – There is no difference in general, actually the type of the API will determine which testing method is suitable. 4.6 – There is no information related to this that you mentioned in item 4.6. 5 – Given in conclusion
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		