

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82167
Title of the Manuscript:	Etravirine lipid nanoparticles: Synthesis and validation using specific RP-HPLC technique
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	N/A	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. Manuscript title showing “<b>Etravirine lipid nanoparticles: Synthesis.....</b>” but in manuscript there is no any lipid nanoparticles synthesis available. Thus title must be corrected.</p> <p>2. In abstract the ‘methods’ heading where the column detail (4.6 × 250mm), mobile phase (methanol &amp; buffer), flow rate (0.8ml/min), and column temperature (26°C) information given are not similar with manuscript body.</p> <p>3. In heading Mobile phase preparation (2.1) author showing acetonitrile autoclaving? What is the requirement of this autoclaving procedure? {500 mL of 100% acetonitrile HPLC class was autoclaved for ten minutes in an ultra-sonic water bath &amp; vacuum purified through a 0.45 mm nylon filter.}</p> <p>In abstract author showing mobile phase by methanol and buffer but in 2.1 showing acetonitrile?</p> <p>4. ‘Standard preparation’ and ‘Sample preparation’ heading is with same content? No stock solution concentration is given clearly.</p> <p>5. Table 1 and Abstract part does not show same value for Flow rate, Column temperature and wavelength?</p> <p>6. In 2.3 heading replicate word is better in place of duplicate.</p> <p>7. In heading range between 10 to 60 gm it must be in micro gram. The range taken in manuscript not similar. Somewhere it was taken 10-50 microgram/ml.</p> <p>8. In key words better use RP-HPLC in place of HPLC.</p> <p>9. In table 2 quantity must be in microgram and show the standard deviation of mean with % recovery column.</p> <p>10. Table 3 must correct the concentration unit.</p> <p>11. Table 5 first column must have the unit.</p> <p>12. In Graph 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Red mark area must be written as ‘retention time of peak’....</p> <p>13. Table content of 6, 7 are not suitably presented.</p> <p>14. LOD and LOQ detail if given in table 1 will be better. No need of red marked area.</p> <p>15. In conclusion column detail is third time give different as in abstract and other paper part. Here acetonitrile is taken as mobile phase but earlier in content is was different. RT time is in this part showing 1.8 min?</p>	

Review Form 1.6

<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Paper must be Grammatically corrected before the publication.	
----------------------------------	---	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Amit Singh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Galgotias University, India</b>