

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Recent Developments in Chemistry and Biochemistry Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3780
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Extracts Makeup of ParkiaBiglobosa Fruit Husk: A Component of Indigenous Mud-Wall-PlasterTechnology in Ghana
Type of the Article	BOOK CHAPTER

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Parkiabiglobosa is one of the most utilised plant that is found in different geographical locations around the world. Even though it is highly utilised by locals for various applications including the one discussed by the author here, detailed knowledge of its chemical composition is rare. This research is therefore important to bridge the knowledge gap.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable as it represents the exact content of the article.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is detailed and contains sufficient summary of the work.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are adequate and appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Detailed phytochemical composition of the plant material was determined using different appropriate scientific methods. The author used different solvents and did not only carry out qualitative analysis to detect the presence of the phytochemicals, he went ahead to determine the quantities present.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are NOT sufficient. The author should add more references to the article to improve its qualities. The format of the references is not consistent. The author should cross check the appropriate referencing style and be consistent in use. E.g. the referencing style of [20] is different from others	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English is suitable except for some few corrections that are needed e.g. the use of 'were' in most of the lines in the METHODS should be replaced with 'was'.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article should be proof read to correct grammatical errors and punctuation appropriately. The author can also separate numerical values from units e.g. 280nm (see HPLC under methods)	

[Review Form2](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b><u>Reviewer's comment</u></b>	<b><u>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)</u></b>
<b><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></b>	<b><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></b>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Barnabas Atsinafe Oshido</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>Benue State University, Nigeria</b>