

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

Jessica Muller

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper reviews a plant that is well studied and showed all the pharmacological activity and phytochemicals. However, there is no discussion about the data and the methods are missing. The data should be better organized to not be so massive to read. Also, the paper has wrong information from some papers.

Abstract – second line “regions for a variety of purposes in treating several human diseases”. Combine this information with the text in lines 8-9 “It is used alone or with other medicinal plants to provide enhanced therapeutic efficacy for treating various ailments.”

Remove the repetition of lines 10-11 as well, too similar with lines 7-8.

Reference 2, you say recently and is a reference from 2008, it is not recently. Change this reference.

Reference 3 and 4, not correlated with what you said the in text.

Family name should not be in italic.

Your introduction is missing a paragraph about what you will talk about in this paper. It finished without an information about the next sections. Also, an information about the method used in the search for the papers used is necessary.

From the phytoconstituents, if you are saying that three isoflavones are new, first time discovered in this species (if I understood correctly), please add the structure of this compounds on table 1.

Good to have a table with all the pharmacological potential and a summary of the findings, concentrations, part of the plant and type of extract, model of study (*in vitro* or *in vivo*) and references. And in the main text, maybe, reduce the quantity of text for each of the activities, discussing more in general the findings about each activity.

Title antibacterial and antimicrobial. Bacteria is a type of microorganism, so, change to only antimicrobial activity.

Antimicrobial activity – in one paragraph the ethanolic extract of stem did not have activity, in the next paragraph the ethanolic extract of fresh barks had, please discuss that. Look for the concentrations and for other papers that show which concentrations can be considerate active, when talking about antimicrobial activity.

Bacteria names should be in italic. After the first citation, abbreviate the genera of the bacteria.

After all the data of antimicrobial activity, what is the discussion? Against which bacteria (or fungi) this plant is better? Which extract and part of the plant is better?

I did not find any information about bioactive fraction in the reference given in the fifth paragraph of anti-inflammatory activity.

All the parameters used in the first paragraph of hepatoprotective section that was already used and abbreviated, please cite abbreviated.

Third paragraph of hepatoprotective activity you said: "The study results revealed that the extract significantly increased the marker enzyme levels in the CCl₄-induced hepatotoxicity model". It is completely the opposite of a hepatoprotection and the opposite of what the cited paper says. Same thing for the next two paragraphs. Wrong interpretation of the data present in the papers.

Fifth paragraph of hepatoprotective activity, "carbon tetrachloride" is the same of CCl₄, why in one place use the abbreviation and in other the full name? Use the full name in the first time and put the abbreviation CCl₄. Use only the abbreviation after that.

Third paragraph (and so on) of antihyperlipidemic activity, started to talk about other activities.

Conclusion – "India is notoriously known to be the Diabetic capital of the world". Reference for this information.

Organize the references, cite all in the same way, for example reference 28 and 43 do not have the title of the paper.