



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_31956
Title of the Manuscript:	Biological activity of different batches of equine chorionic gonadotropin as determined by reversed-phase high-performance liquid chromatography and in vivo assay
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	- Line 44,46 : Is it RT-HPLC or RP-HPLC - What was the stability of eCG in organic solvents?	- Ok. Corrections were insert into the manuscript. - the stability of eCG in organic solvents was previously tested [Alvarez et al. J Vet Sci. 2016;17:459-65]. Briefly, specific picks of RP-HPLC corresponding to the eCG protein were recovered, lyophilized and subsequently suspended in physiological solution. Results of bioassay in rats treated with this material shown that stability of eCG protein was not affected by RP-HPLC.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Validation parameters for the methods can be discussed in the manuscript. - Author should develop the advantage of developed method over other reported chromatographic methods.	- Ok. This information was included in Mat and Met section. - Ok. This informations was included in Discussion section.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		