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Reviewer’s report:

The paper reports the results concerning tablets containing albendazole marked in Addis Ababa. The aim of the work has been attained, the paper is well organized and the methods described in deep. There are still several typo errors throughout the manuscript.

In my opinion, a couple of points requires further attention and revision by the authors:

Page 6, Table 3 and Page 7, Table 5

In the last column of the Table, the average weight ± RSD is reported. The RSD Relative standard deviation is 100*SD/X̄, where X̄ is the absolute value of the mean. SD is the right statistical parameter to be used for describing the distribution of the data. In the Tables RSD must be substituted by SD value and/or the calculated relative standard deviation has to be reported in a separate column.

Page 8, rows 154-159

The obtained results showed that four batches are constituted of tablets with significant differences in weight (Brand 1 - 300 mg, Brand 3 - 2500 mg, Brand 5 - 300 mg and Brand 6 - 2500 mg) and three batches (Brand 4 - 600 mg, Brand 5 - 300 mg and Brand 6 - 2500 mg) API content lower than 90% of nominal load. Only two of the cited batches showed both weight and API loading out of the acceptance range. These findings demonstrate that weight uniformity of tablets not assure the uniform distribution of the API throughout the batch. Moreover, the mass uniformity not allow to assume that the API loading was the same in each tablet of the batch. Therefore, the sentences of the authors are misleading.
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