



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/ACSj/2045
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme Inhibitor, Perindopril Erbumine, In Bulk and Tablet Dosage Form with HPLC

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
My principal comment for the first version was that the revised manuscript should clearly indicate what is the novelty and significance of their research in comparison with already relevant published papers. In results and discussion part (in revised manuscript) authors have not stated any comparison in relation to previously published data. In the Introduction part (Page 3 line 7-11 from the bottom) authors wrote that only three reports are important and in citation there is quotation of 5 literature data - also giving the reference Simončič et al. which is not relevant for their research. On the next page (Page 4 lines 9-11 from the top) authors mentioned 2 papers and not one of those are in relation with internal standard. Internal standard is used in reference by authors Gumieniczek A. and Hopkala H. in my opinion such corrections in the revised manuscript is completely intolerable. For me it was of importance how authors will explain their working (analytical) wavelength 242 nm which is significantly different of those used previously (211 nm, 209 nm and 215 nm) and they point out lower sensitivity (correlation with perindopril UV spectrum). In my opinion it is unacceptable to change the linearity range in revised manuscript is now 8-80 µg/mL and in first version was 16-80 µg/mL and without any comment. Comment for the first version (Lines 74-75 what is the dimension for mass) was not checked what is the molarity of prepared buffer (Page 5 line 2 from the top). Authors extended the references with literature data for HPLC method for PDE in combination with other drugs and those are not relevant for their study. Since I expected that the revised manuscript will be checked and corrected more carefully	1. The reference Simončič et al. is removed (lines 65-69) 2. Gumieniczek, A and Hopkala, H. 1998 reference was included in lines 83 and 84 3. The significance of our research in comparison with already relevant published papers has been reported in section 4. (lines 295-320) 4. The scanning of PDE exhibited two peaks; one at 212 nm and other at 242nm. At both wavelengths selectivity and linearity studies were carried out. The results were satisfactory at 242 nm. So the analytical wavelength was selected as 242 nm (line no. 164-166) 5. During the first revision, one of the reviewers put the following question: The linear concentration range is from 16-80 µg/mL while LOQ is 8 µg/mL. Clarify this difference. To clarify this, the PDE response was checked at 8 µg/mL. Then the linearity parameter was once again performed to check the linearity. (line 227) 6. Molarity of the buffer was reported.(lines 104-106) 7. One of the reviewers suggested including the HPLC references dealing with the determination of perindopril in combination with other drugs. Hence those references were included in the paper as per the reviewer's suggestion.