

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

Fúlvio Rieli Mendes¹

¹ Universidade Federal do ABC

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript titled "Sacred Plants and Their Miraculous or Healing Properties," by Dr. Rosso, presents an interesting topic but can be improved.

The manuscript title gives the idea that the work will discuss historical and modern aspects of "sacred plants," as, in fact, the author does; however, the text emphasizes two species: mandragora and peyote. The manuscript would be better understood if presented as a narrative review about these two species only. Even keeping the manuscript restricted to these two plants, I believe the text should become more readable by reducing the amount of non-essential information (mainly for the peyote).

The division of the text throughout the manuscript makes no sense, in my opinion. The text presented in the section "Material and Methods" is not exactly method. Actually, there are no materials and methods in this manuscript. The author should describe the strategies used to search the literature, criteria of inclusion and exclusion, forms of analysis, and possible limitations. Note that it is unclear how the information presented was obtained without a detailed description of the methods employed.

The author comments about several psychoactive species in the results section and chooses mandragora and peyote for a deeper discussion. This division of results and discussion seems artificial and not logical. In addition, it seems strange that the discussion is divided into two separate sections. I suggest keeping all discussion in section 4 and making subsections when necessary.

Honestly, I believe that it would be more interesting to present this work as two independent reviews, one for mandragora and the other for peyote.

Specific comments:

Several paragraphs in the introduction have no citation.

At the beginning of item 2.1, the author says that the term narcotics encompasses the terms psychoactive, analgesic, stimulant, and visionary substances. Several narcotics produce stimulant effects, but there are uncountable examples of stimulants and analgesic substances that cannot be classified as narcotics. Also, note that section 2.1 brings several definitions, but the text is poorly referenced.

The coffee plant is cited on page 25 as a species from the Americas, but it is originally from Africa.

The main active principles of peyote and *Psilocybe* mushrooms should be cited in the results, as was done for the other species mentioned.

Item 4.2 – Please specify if the toxic doses cited are for extracts of mandragora or some isolated substance.

Minor corrections

Abstract – there is no need to cite any reference, but if you want to cite, you must give enough information to find the publication, since abstracts are usually available without the full text in some platforms.

Figures should always be placed after their citation in the text (several appeared before being cited).

Note that not every figure legend cites the source used. Also, the author must be aware of not using images with copyright without permission.

Figures must be cited sequentially – on page 15, figure 15 is cited before figure 14.

The images used to illustrate the *Atropa belladonna* flower (fig 16) and the *Paullinia cupana* fruit (fig 23) are incorrect. Please, double-check all images.

The number of figures is excessive for a scientific article. There is no need to illustrate all species, books, and documents cited.

Figure 45 doesn't seem suitable to show the occurrence of different species of *Lophophora*.

Beginning of page 59 – What is "Para bye"?

I also suggest a careful revision of punctuation and formatting.