Review of: "The stability of quetiapine oral suspension compounded from commercially available tablets"

Caroline Prouillac

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

This study is well conducted. However, it needs some clarifications.

1/ Authors reported that there is a publication describing a method to compound QF and cited a reference which do not correspond to QF (Pham K, Li D, Guo S, Penzak S, Dong X. Development and in vivo evaluation of child-friendly lopinavir/ ritonavir pediatric granules utilizing novel in situ self-assembly nanoparticles. Journal of controlled release: official journal of the Controlled Release Society. 2016; 226:88–97. doi: S0168-3659(16) 30054-2 [pii])

2/ Why authors didn't study the stability at 40mg/ml as this concentration seems to be used in clinical practice ?

3/ the choice of vehicles is not really discussed (did studies with other active ingredient already ?). It is mentionned that QF is not

4/ chromatograms might be in only one figure

5/A parenthesis is missing “The compounded samples were remained milky white (the appearance in Day 0 over 60 days without any abnormal colors.”

5/ why authors have written non aqueous in this sentence “The data indicate the physical stability of the tested QF nonaqueous suspensions over 60 days” whereas vehicle are auqueous?

6/ has a temperature monitoring been conducted during the study period ?

7/authors mentionned that stability of QF in Sweet vehicle is compromised at 60 days and supposed an hydrolysis phenomenon; have they any argument to this type of degradation ?

8/authors indicated that forced degradation conditions lead to the degradation of QF, are degradation products already described ?