

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_86828
Title of the Manuscript:	Forced Degradation Behaviour with a Developed and Validated RP-UPLC Method for Estimation Lamivudine and Dolutegravir in Combined Pharmaceutical Dosage Form.
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	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "...was linear in the concentration range of 25-150 µg/mL respectively" For this sentence, repectively should be skipped. The linearity should be 37.5-225 µg/mL for Lamivudine and 6.25-37.5 µg/mL for Dolutegravir. Please correct. - "Regression equation of Lamivudine is $y = 24270x + 12218$ and $y = 34783x + 1060$ Dolutegravir." Please revise. <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The review of HPLC analysis of both drugs should be shown. <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purity of standards Lamivudine and Dolutegravir should be shown with the company produced both drugs. - The manufacturing company produced the combination drug should be presented. - Why do the authors use six calibration levels at 25%, 50%, 75%, 100%, 125% and 150% for both the drugs? 25% of what? <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The results and discussion of forced degradation study sholud be focused on this section. - Table 4, 5 and 6 must be described on this section. - All validation data should be compared with the previous studies <p>FIGURES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The unit of x-axis in Fig. 3 and 4 should be given. <p>TABLES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concentration unit in Table 1 is not correct. <p>REFERENCES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please check the format and style of each reference. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pattana Sripalakit
Department, University & Country	Naresuan University, Thailand