



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2014_IRJPAC_9391
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and validation of HPLC-UV method for determination of Bovine Serum Albumin and Myoglobin proteins
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	The following comments should be considered. 1. The experimental conditions such as column length, mobile phase composition, flow rate, etc. used in the work should be optimized. 2. The plots should be added to show the linearity and selectivity for the detection of the two proteins. 3. Some sentences should be corrected or polished e.g. "Figure 1: Chromatogram of Bovine Serum Albumin BSA..." "It is performed at three concentrations covering the range of the method. At each level studied, replicate samples are evaluated." "Range is the interval between the upper and lower levels of analyte..." "A minimum of five	1. I have optimized all chromatographic conditions including column type (stationary phase), column length, mobile phase composition, gradient vs. Isocratic elution, flow rate, injection volume, wavelength of detection which are used for separation of the two proteins, see section 3.1 of the revised manuscript. 2. I have added a figure for linearity (Figure 3). Regarding the selectivity of the method, figure 1 and 2 shows the selectivity of the method for determination of the two proteins (good separation with high resolution between the adjacent peaks). 3. I have reviewed the manuscript and corrected/polished some sentences.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	concentration levels, along with certain minimum specified ranges are required.” 4. There are some mistakes in Table 1 including “RSD 0.64” and “RSD 0.66”. Thus, the manuscript should be revised carefully before acceptance.	4. I have recalculated the RSD (SD/average *100%) for all the values.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		