

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_76928
Title of the Manuscript:	A New High performance Liquid chromatographic method for determination of Vandetanib in Bulk and in Pharmaceutical Forms
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author must change the title, due to there is no new in this study. There are numerous studies about HPLC application used to analyse vandetanib such as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Spectrophotometric determination of vandetanib in Bulk by Area Under Curve and First Order Derivative Methods. b. Development of novel univariate and multivariate validated chemometric methods for the analysis of dasatinib, sorafenib, and vandetanib in pure form, dosage forms and biological fluids. c. Development of novel response surface methodology-assisted micellar enhanced synchronous spectrofluorimetric method for determination of vandetanib in tablets, human plasma and urine. d. Simple and efficient spectroscopic-based univariate sequential methods for simultaneous quantitative analysis of vandetanib, dasatinib and sorafenib in pharmaceutical preparations and biological fluids. e. Liquid chromatographic-tandem mass spectrometric assay for simultaneous quantitation of tofacitinib, cabozantinib and afatinib in human plasma and urine. 2. Add the latest references. 3. As I mentioned before, the authors must use the latest journals as the references owing to there are many journals study about the analysis of vandetanib. 4. The introduction part is too short. The authors must elaborate the reason using HPLC instrument. Furthermore, must explain what are the advantages of using HPLC compared to other instrument? 5. The authors must relate the chemical structure of vandetanib to HPLC application, such as the chromophore. 6. In 2.1.4 Standard solution of the drug, the authors mentioned about 1000 ppm as a standard, what about the other concentrations used to establish a calibration curve? 7. In 2.1.5 Sample solution, in the last sentence the authors have mentioned about obtaining a concentration of 100 ppm, could you explain about it? How come you prepare a sample solution when you have known the specific concentration? What is the purpose of making standard solution? 8. Based on part 2.2 Method development, the authors had studied several parameters such as wavelength, stationary phase and etc. Nevertheless, there are no data of the development study. 9. Based on Figure no. 1 and 2, the run times were done at 8 min yet based on the table 1, the run time is 5 min. Which one is correct? 10. Based on the figure 2, the analysis of sample only has vandetanib peak. Is the sample only has vandetanib as the analyte without other ingredients? Please explain in the discussion part. 11. Based on figure 2, what is the concentration of standard solution the authors analysed? 12. The authors must improve the quality of figure. 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>13. How many detectors you have used in this study? MS? UV? Based on 2.2.5 Optimized LC-MS, you explained about the LC-MS, what about the figure 1 and 2? Please rephrase.</p> <p>14. In Linearity part, line 2, you write about 200-50 ppm yet in the table you have written about 50 – 200 ppm? Which one is correct?</p> <p>15. Based on the table 2, you have 7 concentrations but according to the figure 5, you have 8 concentrations. Please elaborate about this.</p> <p>16. There are many trivial data that no need to presence in this article such as peak area. At least, the authors can explain the important of the data reported.</p> <p>17. If possible, the authors must fragment the figure 4 in order to strengthen this study.</p> <p>18. 3.2 Precision, the authors use 100 ppm in order to study the precision, which the validation study, the authors must use several concentration in order to obtain the better result.</p> <p>19. Please provide the linearity of this study ($y=mx+c$)</p> <p>20. One sample/brand is no sufficient in this study.</p> <p>21. Rephrase the conclusion part.</p>	
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:	Muhammad Abdurrahman Munir
Department, University & Country	Alma Ata University, Indonesia