

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_127313
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Impact of Medicinal Plants on Cardiac Health Compared to Standard Pharmaceuticals Available in Bangladesh: A Systematic Review
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it systematically reviews medicinal plants with potential cardiovascular benefits and compares them to conventional pharmaceutical agents. It highlights the therapeutic promise of 21 locally available plants in Bangladesh, which could lead to safer, natural alternatives for managing cardiovascular health. The comparison with existing drugs provides valuable insights into the limitations of conventional treatments and the need for further exploration of plant-based remedies. However, while the manuscript is well-structured and informative, it would benefit from more rigorous evidence and specific recommendations for future research to strengthen its scientific impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is informative but could be more concise. It provides an overview of the study, but adding key findings, such as the number of plants studied and their specific cardiovascular effects, would improve clarity. Avoid overly broad statements and focus on summarizing the results and implications succinctly.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are mostly appropriate and well-organized, covering key areas such as plant data, drug analysis, discussion, and conclusion.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it provides a systematic review of medicinal plants with cardiovascular benefits, backed by references to credible studies. The inclusion of bioactive compounds, pharmacological activities, and their specific cardiovascular effects demonstrates a clear connection between plant-derived compounds and potential therapeutic applications. Furthermore, the manuscript offers a comparative analysis of pharmaceutical agents, highlighting their mechanisms and side effects, which strengthens the case for exploring plant-based alternatives. However, enhancing methodological transparency and expanding on the pharmacokinetic aspects of plant-derived compounds could further solidify its scientific correctness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient, but there are only a few new ones. It may be beneficial to add more sufficient new references.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are some areas where it can be improved for clarity and precision. While the information is presented in a straightforward manner, some sentences could be more concise or better structured to enhance readability and flow. Additionally, minor grammatical issues, such as inconsistent use of tenses or missing articles, should be addressed to ensure the manuscript aligns with academic standards. Overall, it is clear, but slight revisions could improve its overall scholarly	
Optional/General comments	PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. Murugesan
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Siddha, India