

Review of: "Unravelling the Phytochemical and Pharmacognosy Contour of Traditional Medicinal Plant: Pterocarpus Marsupium Roxb"

Patience Osadebe¹

¹ University of Nigeria

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. Line 9 of the abstract: Remove 'Unite and replace it with 'relate'
2. Under Introduction, paragraph 3, provide references to support the last three sentences
3. Line 1 under 5.0 - Pharmacological activities should read, 'P. marsupium roxb has become an essential source of medicinally active compounds due to -----'
4. Under 5.1-Antidiabetic activity, Line 1: remove the 'potential' before antidiabetic agent
5. Under 5.1, line 10 should read, "The results of the study **showed** and not **suggests**"
6. 5. 2 under Antioxidant Activity - line 20 and 2nd to the last line should read, "The study results**showed** -----"
7. Under 5.3 (Antibacterial and Antimicrobial activity), Line 3 should read, "The study results showed that the extract exhibited -----"
8. Under 5.3, line 8 should read, "The results obtained showed that ----- gave a zone of inhibition (8m)"
9. Under 5.3, line 19 should read, "The authors found that E. coli had the highest (22m) and -----"
10. The last line under 5.3 should read, "The extract showed the highest antibacterial activity against K. pneumoniae"
11. 5.4 (Under anti-cancer activity), line 3 should read, "The obtained results**showed** that -----**exhibited** an apoptosis-----"
12. Under 5.5 (anti-inflammatory activity), line 7 from the bottom should read, "The study results**reveal** -----". Line 2 from the bottom, " -----proffered that (not outline)
13. Under 5.6, line 6: If the extract enhanced the impairment in learning and memory, it cannot at the same time show a memory-enhancement effect, **please crosscheck and recast**
14. **Under 5.7** , line 7 from the top: Remove ,**'in addition'** and replace it with , **"As a result"**
15. Under 5.7, line 11, "The study results were compared with that of 100 mg Silymarin -----". The study**revealed** that the ethanol extract -----(line 12)
16. Line 14 under 5.7. Note that an increase in liver marker enzymes is a sign of hepatotoxicity and not otherwise. Please insert a statement that will summarize the implication of the obtained result.
17. Line 15 under 5.7: The hepatoprotective effect of which extract?
18. Line 16 under 5.7: Not hepatotoxic parameters but rather, liver function markers or parameters. Please correct.

Lines 17 & 18 under 5,7 : I disagree with the conclusion in this paragraph because, while an increase in GSH and SOD

may be indicative of a protective effect, an increase in AST and ALT is usually seen as a sign of liver damage or liver disease. **Please recast to correct the wrong inference**

Line 20 under 5,7: Not "hepatoprotective assessment parameters," but rather "liver activity assessment parameters."

Please correct

Lines 25 & 26 under 5,7. I disagree with the result. The polyherbal formulation is hepatotoxic if it increases SGOT, SGPT, ALP, and serum bilirubin parameters. **Please recast and correct**

5.9 (Under Antihyperlipidemia)

Paragraph 3: **Please recast:** Something that showed a narrow therapeutic window cannot have a wide margin of safety.

Paragraph 4 under 5.9 should read, "Prevented the increase or rise in ----- levels-----."

Paragraph 5, line 4, should read, "The study results revealed, and not concluded."