Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_111019**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Influence of particle size on the phytochemical, antioxidant and anti-inflammatory properties of powder of trunk bark Parkia biglobosa (JACQ) (FABACEAE-MIMOSADEAE)**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	The results are somewhat convincing and informative. The author can present it in a better way by explaining more. This finding opens the opportunity to work on these areas and would be a significant fundamental study on *P. biglobosa.* The title needs to be modified for clarity. Although the abstract is written in an excellent manner, it would be beneficial to include the particle size to enhance understanding. Yes Yes, the results are analyzed statistically. A few more latest references should be added, if available.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	1. The author needs to work on grammer, punctuation etc. For eg., Revise the sentence "The highest yield was obtained with the very fine powder obtained."	
Optional/General comments	1. Cite the reference of the method used in the study "Determination of the residual moisture content (RMC). 2. An author should rewrite the sentence, "Kim et al. method [13] was used to determine the ability of the extracts to reduce DPPH free radicals." It makes no sense to start a paragraph using a reference in the Method section. 3. The title of Table 3 is not appropriate: "Table (3): Extraction yield (R%)". 4. Rewrite the sentence, "The extraction yield depends upon other factors such as edaphic factors, the method of extraction, and the period of collection." Something like that: "The extraction yield depends upon other factors, such as edaphic factors, the extraction method, and the collection period." 5. The TLC graph should be included in the manuscript's result section. 6. Bark powder photos can be added in the result section. 7. All the figures' legends should be appropriately revised. 8. Th length of introduction and conlusions is not upto the mark.	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Alpana Joshi**
Department, University & Country	**Shobhit Institute of Engineering & Technology, India**