



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

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

General guideline for Peer Review process: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- *Is the problem/objective of this study original and important? SCIENCEDOMAIN international strongly opposes the practice of duplicate publication or any type of plagiarism. However, studies which are carried out to reconfirm / replicate the results of any previously published paper with new dataset, may be considered for publication. But these types of studies should have a 'clear declaration' of this matter. If you suspect any unethical practice in this manuscript, kindly write it in the report with some proof/links.*
- *Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability and technical standards of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods/process should be provided so that another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described)*
- *Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*
- *Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only. Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without overselling them)*
- *Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?*
- *SDI believes in constructive criticism. Reviewers are encouraged to be honest but not offensive in their language. It is expected that the reviewer should suggest the authors on how they can strengthen their paper to make it acceptable. Comments of the reviewers should be sufficiently informative and helpful to reach a Editorial Decision. We strongly advise that a negative review should also explain the weaknesses of any manuscript, so that the concerned authors can understand the basis of rejection and he/she can improve the manuscript based on those comments. Authors also should not confuse straightforward and true comments with unfair criticism.*
- *We are very much reluctant to go against suggestions (particularly on technical areas) of the reviewers. Therefore, authors are requested to treat the suggestions of reviewers with utmost importance.*
- *This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.*



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The principal remark and comment is in the relation to literature survey. The declaration, written at Page 2 (lines 50-51) that only one HPLC method has been described in the literature for determination of Perindopril Erbumine, PDE, is not the truth. Several papers are relevant and were published previously: 1. Prameela Rani A., Bala Sekaran C., A validated RP-HPLC method for the determination of perindopril erbumine in pharmaceutical formulations, <i>International Journal of PharmTechResearch</i>, 1(3), 575-578 (2009) First author of above paper is the second author (with different affiliation) in the manuscript submitted to International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry and the last author is the coauthor of above previously published paper 2. G.M. Khomushku et al., Analysis of the angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors perinopril, lisinopril and quinapril by HPLC, <i>Pharmaceutical Chemistry Journal</i> 44(11) 619-623 February (2011) 3. Anna Gumieniczek and Hanna Hopkala, High-performance liquid chromatographic assay for perindopril in tablets, <i>Chem. Anal. (Warsaw)</i> 43, 951-954 (1998)	1. The introduction part has been revised thoroughly. 2. New references are included. 3. The advantages of the proposed method has been highlighted



SDI Review Form 1.6

	If Editor decides to give authors the opportunity for serious major revision, the revised manuscript should clearly indicate what is the novelty and significance of their research study in comparison with already published data.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	-Terminology in line 109 to saturate the column should be more appropriate -Terminology - onto the column (line 111) and into the column (line 116) should be harmonized correctly - Line 111 the peaks were determined should be corrected as - peaks were recorded -Abbreviation PDE used throughout the text, it is not correct in lines 112, 126, 156 since another abbreviation is used PPD - Line 74 dihydrogen should be corrected - Line 150 was prepared should be were prepared - Manufacturer of analytical column lines 64-65 should be added - Lines 74-75 what is the dimension for mass - Lines 78-80 unusual denotation mobile phase A and mobile phase B for isocratic elution, appropriate for gradient mode - Line 116 instead Ten μL of tablet extract should be changed as Aliquot (10 μL) of tablet extract - Line 128 instead After trying should be changed After applying - Quality of Figures 2 and 3 should be better - Literature citation from lines 32-34 should be replaced in line 36 - Monograph for perindopril in European Pharmacopoeia 6th ed. 2008 or 7th ed should be added - Authors should rechecked the equation for regression analysis	All the points are corrected as per the suggestions of the reviewer
Optional/General comments	-The Abstract in revised manuscript should include all relevant data on linearity, as well as LOD and LOQ values. - Experiments in relation to selection of optimal pH value (pH range should be quoted) in method optimization should be added	1. The abstract was revised 2. Optimization experiments are clearly discussed 3. ICH citation included 4. Robustness and precision have been



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-For analytical method validation the relevant regulation literature (ICH, pharmacopoeia or FDA) should be cited. - Experiments for robustness, as well as appropriate data for precision (repeatability and intermediate precision) have to be carried out for complete method validation.	done
--	---	------