Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_85648**
Title of the Manuscript:	**EXTRACTION, PHYTOCHEMICAL SCREENING AND ANTIOXIDANT POTENTIAL OF HYDROALCOHOLIC EXTRACT OF AERIAL PARTS OF BAUHINIA VARIEGATA**
Type of the Article	

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:

(https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy)

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	The trajectory is very oriented, without embargo, to keep the multiples of the details of the recaccation not relevant but the menores, the trajectory is very formulaic, the studio nos orienta hackia the estimation of the content of ingredients containing flavonoids and flavonoids de la (Bauhinia variegata). This means contributing to the advancement of the potential for the development of potential antioxidants in the extraction of hydroalcoholic components of this species. This should be done in order to make it easier for you to get rid of the finer points that are too much for your argument.	
Minor REVISION comments	The details are simple and fast corrections to give a major feeling to the redaccount of the article and as it improves its efficiency, without relevance to the correlation of corrections.	
Optional/General comments	Examine the details of the article before it is published, which contains corrections, even numerical numbers, not included in the publication, because it will not be officially finalized.	

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:	**Rigoberto Alarcon Rojas**
Department, University & Country	**Universidad Politecnica Territorial de Merida "Kleber Ramirez" (UPTMKR), Venezuela**