



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_26825
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF STABILITY INDICATING UFLC METHOD FOR THE ESTIMATION OF ANTI-SPASMODIC DRUG - VALETHAMATE BROMIDE
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract Line 5: write UFLC in full and bracket UFLC. Use abbreviation in subsequent writings; V and B words in the drug name should be in lowercase. Line 8: 250 X 4.6 mm ; 250× 4.6 mm, C18; C₁₈ Line 14 and 15: full definition of LOD, LOQ, ICH and bracket them. Use abbreviations in subsequent writings. Line 15: period after guidelines. Start with The drug-----. Line 16: UV radiation ; etc Line 17: was passing; passed Line 18: their estimation; it Line 19: lowercase for V and B respectively. Introduction Line 23: d; D Line 24: B is lowercase; Line 30: it enables; for; Line 30: periods; Line 31: Dismenore, in the birth (during), full definition INF and bracket it.; Line 33: full definition API and bracket it.; Line 45: comma after literature; Line 50: U, F, L, C all in lowercase; Line 50: period after chromatography. and to focus----- to line 53 ; Line 54: V and B in lowercase.; Line 59: B in lowercase; Line 60: was, were; Line 63: U, F, L, C all in lowercase, used to be of; from Experimental Line 65: Auto; auto, Diode; diode; Line 71: i.e, that is; Line 77: ratios; ratio, phosphate buffer; Line 78: have been used, ratios, (potassium-----was, (50:50). Line 81: upon the response ;on absorbance, where it ----- good response.; Line 83: medium; blank.; Line 91: using	Line 5: Expanded UFLC. Used abbreviations V and B for drug Valethamate bromide. Line 8: changed 250 X 4.6 mm; as 250× 4.6 mm, C18; C₁₈. Line 14 and 15: Expanded LOD, LOQ and ICH Line 15:, Line 16:, Line 17:, Line 18: & Line 19: Changed as per the instruction Line 23:, Line 30:, Line 31:, Line 33:, Line 45:, Line 45:, Line 50:, line 53:, Line 54:, Line 59:, Line 60:, and Line 63: were corrected. Line 65:, Line 71:, Line 77:, Line 78:, Line 81:, Line 83:, Line 91:, Line 96:, Line 101, 102:, Line 111:, Line 115:, Line 119:, Line 123:, Line 137:,



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 96: was transferred into 1000 mL; Line 101, 102: P in lowercase; Line 111: wall protected from light; Line 115: upto; up to; Line 119: was; is; Line 123: was transferred into 100 mL; Line 137: is, was; in, at three different, levels (50 % ---- 150 %); Line 138: at 50 % ---- 150 %. to; with.; Line 139: are; were; Line 144: full definition RSD and bracket it; Line 148: using the following; Line 153: of by; Line 177, line 181, 185: V, B in lowercase Line 187: was added and kept aside for 24 h, after which the, upto; up to; Line 189: and; was Line 190: 24 h. After 24 h transfer the powder was transferred to a 10 mL Line 191: makeup; made, Filter The solution was filtered and further diluted to obtain Results and discussion Line 198: In the present study, we developed, HPLC; UFLC; Line 203: ratios, &; and; Line 206: for the drug Line 208: trails; trays; Line 210: HPLC; UFLC; Under peak quality in Table 1, no.4 time is was long, trails; trays Line 214, 218: V, B in lowercase; Line 217: should not be-----; Figure 3: Delete the gridlines; Line 226, 228: I, B in lowercase; Table 3: concentration ng/ml; µg/ml; Line 246, 255, 257: V, B, D, Q in lowercase; Line 264: Incomplete sentence; Table 7: V, B in lowercase, Tailing factor; Line 277: V, B in lowercase, table 8; Table 8 Line 293, 296, 298: V, B, A, D, P, S in lowercase. Conclusion Line 328: Hence; hence; Line 319: a novel method for analyzing; Line 320: accurate method has been developed Line 321: dosage form and was used-----; Line 322: suitable for their; the analysis and recovery is; was----- Line 323: test is; was established-----.	Line 138.; Line 139.; Line 144.; Line 148.; Line 153.; Line 177: 185 & 185.; corrected as suggested by reviewers. Line 187.; Line 189.; Line 190.; and Line 191.; Corrected Line 198.; Line 203.; Line 208.; Line 210.; and Line 214: corrected. Figure 3: Deleted the gridlines Line 226.; 228: Table 3: Concentration ng/ml changed to µg/ml; Line 246, 255.; 257: and 277: changed. table 8; changed to Table 8 Line 293, 296: and 298: changed.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Line 328:, Line 319:, Line 320:, Line 321:, Line 322: and Line 323: completed.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Red colour: delete Blue colour: add The authors are responsible for ensuring that the references complied with the journal's format.	
Optional/General comments	(a) The design and execution of the study are satisfactory. The manuscript contains many spelling errors, omitted words and some unnecessary paragraphs. The reviewer has tried to make much correction as possible. (b) The alteration of column temperature in the study of robustness was not significant to affect the data results. (c) The peak heights in all the chromatograms are found to be quite small. (d) Was there any drug degradation? If yes, the chromatograms for the degradation studies (Figures 9-15) failed to show any peak for the degradant(s). (e) It was noted that the authors employed changes in peak area of the pure drug to follow the degradation process. This could be in error because the small changes observed in the peak areas of the pure drug might have arisen from alterations in injection volumes since external method was used in the chromatographic analysis. (f) On the basis of lack of degradant peaks in the chromatograms of the stress study, the title of this paper is considered not to be very suitable. It would be better if the title indicates that the study is a routine analytical method for the determination of the drug in pure form and its dosage products rather than as stability indicating analytical method.	(a) Typographical mistakes and grammatical errors are corrected (b) Effect of temperature is one of the parameter in robustness and hence effect of temperature is studied (30 °C column temperature changed to $\pm 5^{\circ}\text{C}$ that is 25 °C and 35 °C). (d) Figures 9-15 is chromatograms of degradation studies, no change in chromatograms and no additional peaks are obtained there is only change in peak area. (e) Forced degradation studies were carried out and there is only change in the peak area. (f) Since no degradants were observed when subjected to forced degradation studies. Forced degradation studies is a part of our research work, I feel it is required to report the degradation studies in fact there were no degradants were observed when it is subjected to forced degradation.