

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_96139
Title of the Manuscript:	A REVIEW ON BIOANALYTICAL METHOD DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION FOR ESTIMATION OF ANTIVIRAL DRUGS BY USING HYPHENATED TECHNIQUES AND ITS APPLICATIONS ON ROUTINE ANALYSIS
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	The study is interesting and this paper has a potential to be accepted, but some important points have to be clarified or fixed before proceeding 1. The content is appealing but it can be well structured. 2. There are some grammatical mistakes and sentence can be reframed (pointed the sentence in the text provided in yellow) 3. The references should be reduced and only relevant and latest references should be included. 4. The format of reference should also be corrected (follow single format). 5. Conclusion should be more elaborated and should provide justification and importance of the study which is missing.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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:	Deepa Srivastava
Department, University & Country	DDU Gorakhpur University, India