

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

Marco Biagi¹

¹ University of Siena

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This review took into account a species scarcely investigated, worthy of being studied.

I believe that the authors did a good job trying to review the phytochemical and pharmacological characteristics of the species, and I encourage them to revise the manuscript according to the valuable reviewers' suggestions.

From my point of view, I agree with the reviewers who found the missing description of the chemical characterization of extracts used for different diseases or dysregulations to be a major pitfall: in this current version, it is not possible to understand the relationship between the chemical composition of different preparations and pharmacological activities.

Furthermore, I truly suggest using the golden rule for reviewing natural products: first, clinical trials and human studies should be described, as they are the most relevant; then animal models; and finally, in vitro tests and the description of mechanisms. Pharmacological activities should be described in this order, by clinical relevance and/or pharmacological potentiality.

Minor issues: many typos occur; botanicals and technical terms should be revised; the botanical family is not in italics; references should be uniform; chemical structures should be drawn in the same style.