

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <b>Archives of Current Research International</b>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_ACRI_96139</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>A REVIEW ON BIOANALYTICAL METHOD DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION FOR ESTIMATION OF ANTIVIRAL DRUGS BY USING HYPHENATED TECHNIQUES AND ITS APPLICATIONS ON ROUTINE ANALYSIS</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Review Article</b>  |

### 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments<br><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)<br><br><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)<br><br><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b><br><br><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b><br><br><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b><br><br><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b><br><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b> | In my opinion, the way in which the work is presented does not constitute a review. Only in a few parts there is a discussion of what is found in the literature. What predominates is the presentation of a compilation without discussion of what has been published, issues that can be found in any text, standards guidelines, etc. On the other hand, it lacks elegance in the presentation of results, abusing items as if they were a lesson. There is an indiscriminate and inconsistent use of capital letters and several errors that denote a lack of review of the submitted manuscript. The title is not suitable. The structure is not appropriate. 26% of the references are from the last 5 years. 36% are from the last 10 There are several incomplete references. (5%) For a review paper 36% is not enough. |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments<br><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>   | Yes  |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Lourdes Zumalacárregui de Cárdenas</b>       |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Technological University of Havana, Cuba</b> |