Below I present one suggestion and five questions/corrections, which can also be found in the manuscript. Although they do not invalidate the Author's work, I believe they can contribute to improving the content.

Section: 2.2.1

Suggestion: How about “Wavelength Selection”?

Section: 2.2.4

Question 1: What was the number of theoretical plates in each flow? The highest value indicates the ideal flow.

Section: 3.1

Question 2: For the calculation of the equation and correlation coefficients you forced the line to pass through the origin (0,0). This is not exactly a mistake. However, it is important to know if the 0.0 point belongs to the calculated line. For this, we cannot include the 0.0 point in the calculations. In this way, we can calculate the intercept's standard deviation and thus obtain its confidence limits. If zero is within this confidence interval, then we can be sure that there is no bias. I suggest reading Chapter 2 of the ICH guideline cited, especially the following excerpt: “*The correlation coefficient, y-intercept, slope of the regression line and residual sum of squares should be submitted. A plot of the data should be included. In addition, an analysis of the deviation of the actual data points from the regression line may also be helpful for evaluating linearity.*”.

Section: 3.2.1

Question 3: ICH (https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/Q2%28R1%29%20Guideline.pdf) recommends working with **9 replicates**. By the way, since you determined the standard deviation, you could have determined the ideal number of replicates (important for those who will reproduce your methodology) and associate the resulting uncertainty with your experimental results.

Section: 3.3

Question 4: How did you decide that 3.326 minutes equals 3.315 minutes? Student's t test?

Section: 3.5

Question 5: In Chapter 6 the ICH recommends various ways to determine the DL (and QL). Why did you use the simpler one (6.1), which is only recommended for non-instrumental methods?