

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_123087
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review about Better Analytical Technique for Determining Febuxostat in the Blood Plasma for Bioavailability and Bioequivalence Studies
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

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 represents a significant contribution to the scientific community by providing an in-depth analysis of the use of Liquid Chromatography with Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS) for evaluating the bioavailability and bioequivalence of Febuxostat (FBS) in human plasma. The review's exploration of innovative analytical techniques and validation methods, especially with the use of Febuxostat d9 and d7 as internal standards, offers a comprehensive understanding of the complex pharmacokinetics of FBS.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes title of the article is suitable	
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.	<p>Some suggestions are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. kindly highlight the bioavailability and Bioequivalence 2. Also highlight about Mass Spectrometry 3. Elaborate the mechanism of inflammation in gout 4. In some table citation are missing 5. Reference are not Up to the mark. 6. Kindly correct the spelling of few word highlighted in green 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness by employing well-established analytical methodologies, such as Liquid Chromatography with Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS), recognized for their exceptional sensitivity and specificity in pharmacokinetic studies.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes references is sufficient and recent	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes its is suitable for the scholarly communications	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Sourav Khawas
Department, University & Country	Jharkhand Rai University, India