

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Chemical Science International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CSIJ_117069</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>STABILITY INDICATING RP-HPLC METHOD DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION FOR ANTI-DIABETIC DRUG IN PHARMACEUTICAL DOSAGE FORM</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research</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.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/editorial-policy> )

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Topic is very common, many work related to this topic was published.</b></p> <p><b>No</b></p> <p>No, Its should be advise to reframe the abstract Properly.</p> <p>No, Its necessary to revise</p> <p>Its average</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p> <p>MAJOR REVISION</p>	<p>Authors need to advise the rewrite the Introduction part with proper justification and Information.</p> <p>Objective is not a part of any research article.</p> <p>Lacking of explanation of figures and tables in text.</p> <p>Many tables have been showed in the Result part, try to reduce it.</p> <p>Lots of spelling and grammatical error has been observed through the whole manuscript.</p> <p>Some details need to rewrite properly with proper scientific language for example material validation in material section.</p> <p>In results and discussion section, Discussion part is lacking.</p> <p>Need to rewrite the conclusion , Its must be Point to Point only, so readers can easily understood the specific message want to given by authors.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Priya Patel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Saurashtra University, India</b>