

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77287
Title of the Manuscript:	Bio-analytical approach for stability studies of Bendroflumethiazide materials
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	This paper is a Bio-analytical approach for stability studies of Bendroflumethiazide materials. The introduction does not describe the state of the art and the authors should report more clearly the hypotheses and the expected results. The novelty and development of the method used need to be seriously discussed. the presentation of the manuscript needs to be significantly improved and there is a clear lack of data as well as the references on this method. However, it is clear that the authors show some statistical analysis It is essential for publication to clearly rewrite and submit it.	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The abstract should be completely re-done and the objective of the work should be clearly highlighted. - Introduction does not include the state of art and the expected results. - The reference cited are not enough to compared this study on the previous ones. - The author has to specify which solvent he have used in the part of the experimental part? - The experimental part does not show any spectra of HPLC, did the author used this method or based only on statistical data? - The results part does not include any references to previous work, the results and comparison were only compared to some percentage without any references included. Please provide references on the field. - The results obtained have to be decorticate and more detailed on every statistical numbers the author has provide. - The results description reads like a report and major deficit in the scientific discussion is missed. 	
Optional/General comments	-Please try to improve the writing language.	

Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>N'ghaya Toulbe</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>National Institute of Materials Physics, Romania</i>