

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Biotechnology Journal International |
| Manuscript Number: | Original Manuscript_BJI_117924 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Development and validation of chromatographic methods for the quantification of impending genotoxic impurities in Dapson drug substances |
| Type of the Article | Research |

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.journalbjournal.com/index.php/BJI/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>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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>1. Yes the manuscript has importance for scientific community such as pharmaceutical field.</p> <p>2. Yes the title is suitable</p> <p>3. Yes the abstract is comprehensive and covers all the points from article</p> <p>4. 3rd Major heading should be material and methods instead of Experiment</p> <p>5. Yes the manuscript is scientifically correct but need additional study</p> <p>6. Yes the references are recent but it should be better to add few more</p> <p>7. Additional study regarding robustness of the method should be carried out as it is one of the key criteria for method validation</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Yes the language quality is suitable for scholarly publication</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Pratik Prakash Terse |
| Department, University & Country | Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Technological University, India |