

# Review of: "Sacred Plants and Their Miraculous or Healing Properties"

Inocencio E. Buot<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of the Philippines

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

1. I think the paper is very timely given the prevailing mental health issues on the global scene. We might be able to positively use the plants discussed in the paper to help address pressing concerns about mental health.
2. The discussion is extensive, citing several historical usages and focusing on 2 very important and extremely relevant species: mandrake and peyote.
3. The introduction should spell out the objectives in the last paragraph so that the readers will have an idea already of what to expect from a paper of such length. Will there be a chance to reduce the number of pages?
4. There is a need to be very specific about the use of common names and scientific names. The authors should be very sure that the names mentioned here correspond to the actual plants used in the past. Common names may represent several species, which could be confusing as we read through and could be very dangerous later as we explore the medical value of the species. I verified from the World Flora Online Plant List that the valid name for mandrake would be *Mandragora officinarum* L., NOT *Atropa mandragora* L.

Please see these links: <https://wfo.plantlist.org/taxon/wfo-0001019437-2023-12?page=1>, referring to *Atropa mandragora*, and <https://wfo.plantlist.org/taxon/wfo-0001023507-2023-12?page=1>, referring to *Mandragora officinarum*. Please use only one name. NO "or" please, as this will add confusion.

5. As for peyote, I noticed from the paper that it is a common name for many species? If so, then this has to be clearly declared at the start of Discussion 2.
6. A map on the global distribution of mandrake and peyote would be very helpful. There is actually one for peyote (for Mexico only), but none for mandrake. A map can be included showing the current distribution of these important species, both natural distributions and introductions. An alternative to maps would be tables.
7. Tables on the distribution of various bioactive compounds of the plants would be desirable rather than presenting them textually. Some of these compounds are only in roots, and others are in roots, stem, leaves, etc. Tabulated information will be a welcome addition for readers and users, indeed.
8. Would "sacred plants" be more appropriate than "narcotic plants" as the generic name for this group? Can the authors suggest and have this included in the discussion or, at the very least, in the conclusion?
9. Some minor editorial comments: Figures or tables should appear only after being mentioned in the manuscript. Sometimes, this is confusing, especially if you are reading about a particular species and the figure that immediately follows is not actually the figure cited (eg., Fig 16 on p. 21 was cited on page 22 and is immediately followed by Fig 18-19). This is just an example. Many other instances are found on various pages in the manuscript. Another one would

be to have the paper edited. Maybe one of the authors can reread the paper. It is true that with familiarity, comes the difficulty to detect even the slightest typo or grammatical error.

10. Apart from these, the paper is very informative.