

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

Christian Bailly

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Another review on the medicinal plant *Pterocarpus marsupium*... There are already similar reviews in the literature. This additional one brings no novel information, no originality.

It would be useful to illustrate further the review, with photos of the plant and schemes to explain the mechanism of action of key products.

Section 3. The table (without text) "Taxonomic classification" is useless.

The organization of the paper is not always logical. For example, the anticancer section contains sentences related to diabetes. Apart from citing references, there is no critical analysis of the data and no discussion. IC50 values are cited and so what? These values are not sufficient to claim an anticancer activity and any utility to treat patients.

There are other key bioactive products isolated from *P. marsupium* not discussed in this review. The analysis of the plant literature is partial.

The review should address more precisely the types of medicinal products used: decoction, infusion, ointments, etc... and the methods/processes used locally to prepare the medicinal products.

Conclusion. What means the "Diabetic capital of the world" ? A more profound analysis is needed. There is no doubt that *P. marsupium* contains bioactive phytoconstituents but this is the case for any medicinal plant. What are the specificities of this plant and its added value compared to other medicinal plants.

In brief, this review presents a limited interest, if any. There are recent reviews on the same plant (Ahmad et al., Plants 2022;11:247). An additional review is not justified.

Other points

- *Pterocarpus marsupium* Roxb. Add « . » after Roxb.: the abbreviation comes from the scientist at the origin of the plant: William Roxburgh (1799). And change Marsupium to marsupium (title).
- The abstract contains superfluous sentences, such as "a lot of commercial (??) and medicinal researchers have focused on resources from various herbs." Delete to maintain a scientific focus.
- Intro, line 2. "Recently, the WHO...." With a reference [2] from 2008. Is it recent?

- Intro, "*Pterocarpus* is a large deciduous tree". The same sentence is repeated in the botanical description. Useless.