

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_114918
Title of the Manuscript:	Quality Assurance and in-vitro bioequivalence Analysis of Amlodipine besylate tablets in Bayelsa State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Research

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Recent References not added</p> <p>The research work done in the manuscript is scare to come to any conclusion.</p> <p>Following points were observed:</p> <p># No details of the 5 brands of the drug used are mentioned (atleast mention Lot no, RS EN no, expiration date). Also no reference is used to compare results. A branded reference drug should be used and its all details should be mentioned.</p> <p># Statistical Analysis is not done to analyse the result</p> <p># Only one media is used for dissolution study, whereas different media of different pH should be used for comparing the dissolution profiles.</p> <p># I couldn't understand why Extraction of pure amlodipine and UV analysis was done for Brand E only, and not all brand A, B, C, D. How then the results were comparable.</p> <p># Assay for percentage drug content was not performed for all brands which implies the study is not complete to suggest that 'The results of the in-vitro examination of amlodipine brands showed good overall quality, a satisfactory dissolving rate, and bioequivalence. As a result, the analyzed brands could be utilized interchangeably with brands'.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Many grammatical errors were found, which needs to be corrected</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rina Das
Department, University & Country	M. M. College of Pharmacy, Maharishi Markandeshwar Deemed to be University, India