

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_126718
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comprehensive Guide to Applicative Requirements for Analytical Method Validation Across Various Regulatory Guidance: ICH, USP, ChP and ANVISA
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript shares few information regarding validation as per guidelines of ICH, USP, ChP and ANVISA. Some validation tools are explained but proper references are not included.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract should be rewritten.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and quite informative.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The results are presented should be more clear and concise. The authors should discuss the limitations of their study and suggest directions for future research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	So many corrections are needed in reference section. You add 18,19, and 20th no references but it is not shown in main body of your manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language quality should be updated in order to ensure novelty of the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	None	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aysha Akhter Mim
Department, University & Country	Jahangirnagar University, Bangladesh