

[Review Form3](#)

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Book Name:               | <a href="#">Pharmaceutical Science: New Insights and Developments</a>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_BPR_4074</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Eco-Friendly Stability Indicating HPLC Method for Estimation of Elbasvir and Grazoprevir by Quality by Design Approach</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Book chapter</b>   |

**PART 1: Comments**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b> | A well developed analytical method for the combination dosage form. Single analytical method for both the molecules (Elbasvir and Grazoprevir). Complete validation was achieved consistent with ICH guidelines. QbD approach for analytical method development is an additional value for this manuscript. Eco friendly approach is also a thought provoking process for the future scientist. |  |
| <b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>   | Title is appropriate.   |  |
| <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>      | My humble request is to avoid any subtitles in the abstract.  |  |
| <b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>  | Manuscript is scientifically correct. All validation parameters were suitably applied to demonstrate the suitability of the method.   |  |
| <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b><br>-                         | Sufficient.   |  |
| <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>  | I personally believe this is enough for communications.   |  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  | Suggest to mention the % of degradation for each conditions achieved during forced degradation study in the specificity section.  |  |

[Review Form3](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| <b><u>Name:</u></b>                                | <b><u>Kannan Jakkan</u></b> |
| <b><u>Department, University &amp; Country</u></b> | <b><u>USA</u></b>           |