

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_104683
Title of the Manuscript:	Forced degradation and stability indicating studies for Clomifene Citrate Tablet
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:

(<https://www.journalajocs.com/index.php/AJOCS/editorial-policy>)

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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes, but it should be improved in the introduction where the methods are there should be more of the work. ICH is not followed exactly, there should be prepared experiments for intra and inter day and spike methods, accuracy, another method to prove the first one, experimental part should be separated from results. 2. The title is good 3. The abstract in the mobile phase to be in direction v/v 4. Ok, but ICH is not only stability and robustness should be more experiments 5. Yes, what is written sounds well 6. The references are good	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is good	
Optional/General comments	//	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olga Popovska
Department, University & Country	“Mother Teresa” University in Skopje, North Macedonia