

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80768
Title of the Manuscript:	Method development and Validation of a specific stability indicating RP002DHPLC method for Molnupiravir API
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:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This manuscript is high quality for publication after minor revision. - The title and abstract cover the main aspect of the work - Abstract is okay, informative. - This topic also a special issue regarding the current pandemic COVID-19 treatment options. - So, the title is relevant are the results are novel and data generated seems plausible. - The methods are clear and results match with the methods - Make sure you place a gap between number and unit except in %. E.g., 250mm × 4.6mm × 5μ - Figures and tables need to be improved. Such as insertion of captions and cross referenced in the main text. <p>English editing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Check all typos in this section (a typographical error) authors are advised to carefully proof-read the text. ✍ as well as “the” stability-indicating studies.” the” should be replaced by “for” ✍ Waters 2695 using Agilent Zorbax Eclipse C18 (250mm × 4.6mm × 5μ). Rewrite as “Waters 2695 using an Agilent Zorbax Eclipse C18 (250 mm × 4.6 mm × 5 μ). ✍ Moreover, it is highly recommended to include weaknesses of the study and potential recommendations. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I would like to recommend automated referencing tools such as Endnote or Mendeley desktop reference managers for consistent referencing style. - Don't the whole authors of the work in the reference section please some of them followed by <i>et al.</i> Please format them consistently. - Better to insert captions for tables and figures in the manuscript and should be cross referenced in the text. 	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Woretaw Sisay Zewdu
Department, University & Country	Debre Tabor University, Ethiopia