



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JPRI_55978</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Optimization of the Extraction Procedure of Apixaban from Dried Rat Plasma Spots</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short communication</b>

**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>)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<p><b>Question 1:</b> In Figures 2c and 2d the authors reported that for mixtures of MeOH:H<sub>2</sub>O and ACN:H<sub>2</sub>O "the addition of 0.1% formic acid resulted in about 30% reduced extraction". Why the authors chose to add FA to the extractor solvent to evaluate the optimal extraction temperature (Fig. 3), optimal extraction time (Fig. 4) and volumes of solvent (Fig. 5)?</p> <p><b>Question 2:</b> The title of the figure 4 is "Normalized atenolol recovery from DPS at different temperature: MeOH:0,1% of FA in H<sub>2</sub>O mixture (a), ACN:0,1% of FA in H<sub>2</sub>O mixture (b), MeOH:H<sub>2</sub>O mixture (c), MeOH:ACN mixture (d)." The title does not match the results described.</p>	<p>During the first experiments we tested only the solvent type with fixed time, temperature and volume. As we did not know how 0.1% formic acid will influence on extraction in different conditions, we have decided to check it in following experiments to be sure that 0.1% formic acid adding decres the extraction of apixaban from DPS.</p> <p>Corrected.</p> <p>Thank you for the reviewing our article!</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>In conclusion, the authors mentioned "For better optimization, additional experiments must be performed with detailed parameterization in the range set in this work." In this context, the authors could cite examples of additional experiments.</p>	<p>We meant that, based on the data obtained, it is necessary to carry out a study in a more accurate range, where parameter changes most strongly affected the extraction.</p>



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**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> .	We did not work with animals directly; the plasma was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich.