

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_127721
Title of the Manuscript:	Ficus exasperata (Vahl) plant: A brief review of its phytochemical properties and pharmacology
Type of the Article	Review paper

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>Ficus exasperata (Vahl): A Brief Review of Phytochemical and Pharmacological Properties</p> <p>Abstract: Ficus exasperata (Vahl), commonly known as the "sandpaper tree," is traditionally used for managing diabetes, inflammation, infections, ulcers, and hypertension, among others. Phytochemical studies reveal the presence of tannins, flavonoids, saponins, steroids, and glycosides. Pharmacological studies highlight its anti-inflammatory, anticonvulsant, antiarthritic, antioxidant, hypoglycemic, and antimicrobial activities. However, toxicity studies indicate potential hepatic and renal risks. Further toxicological evaluations are needed to optimize its therapeutic applications.</p> <p>Keywords: Traditional medicine, phytochemistry, pharmacology, toxicity, Ficus exasperata.</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The title is clear and relevant, but it can be made more engaging and specific. Here are some alternative suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> "Ficus exasperata (Vahl): A Comprehensive Overview of Its Phytochemical and Therapeutic Potential" "Therapeutic Insights into Ficus exasperata: Phytochemistry, Pharmacology, and Toxicity" "Ficus exasperata (Vahl): Traditional Uses and Modern Pharmacological Perspectives" "Phytochemical and Therapeutic Profile of Ficus exasperata (Vahl)" <p>Each alternative emphasizes the main themes of the article while making the title more appealing. Let me know if you'd like further refinements!</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive and provides a good overview of the article's content. However, it could be improved by ensuring consistency, removing redundant information, and highlighting the findings' significance. Here are my suggestions:</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Clarify the Aim: <p>The aim is mentioned briefly but can be made more precise. For example, instead of "a documentary search," explicitly state that the aim is to consolidate scientific evidence on the plant's properties and potential applications.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Simplify the Results Section: <p>The list of phytochemicals and pharmacological activities is quite long. Highlight only the most significant findings in the abstract to keep it concise.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">3. Highlight Toxicity Findings: <p>The mention of toxicity is crucial but could be presented more clearly. Instead of detailing increased serum transaminases, summarize that toxicity studies indicate potential risks to liver and kidney health.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">4. Conclude with the Importance: <p>Add a statement about the potential for future applications in drug development or the importance of this review for guiding further research.</p> <p>Revised Abstract Example:</p> <p>Abstract Ficus exasperata (Vahl) is widely used in traditional medicine for treating various ailments such as diabetes, inflammation, ulcers, hypertension, and infections. This review consolidates data on its phytochemical and pharmacological properties. Key bioactive compounds include tannins, flavonoids, saponins, steroids, and glycosides, which contribute to its anti-inflammatory, hypoglycemic, antioxidant, anticonvulsant, and antimicrobial activities. Toxicological studies highlight potential hepatic and renal risks at high doses, emphasizing the need for dose optimization. This review provides a foundation for further research on the plant's therapeutic potential and its safe application in drug development.</p> <p>This version eliminates redundancy, provides clear focus, and adds a forward-looking statement to enhance relevance. Let me know if you'd like further adjustments!</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically accurate based on the provided details, as it consolidates information from documented studies about Ficus exasperata and its phytochemical, pharmacological, and toxicological aspects. The organization of the review and the inclusion of evidence-based data suggest a well-researched approach. However, a few areas could be reviewed to ensure scientific rigor:</p> <p>Suggestions for Verification:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Referencing Source Credibility: <p>Confirm that all cited studies are from peer-reviewed, reputable journals or primary research sources. This ensures reliability and scientific validity.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Clarity in Toxicological Data: <p>The manuscript discusses toxicity findings, but it's essential to verify if the reported effects on serum transaminases and other markers are supported by comprehensive studies, including dosage ranges and models (in vitro or in vivo).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">3. Comprehensive Discussion of Phytochemistry:	

Review Form 3

	<p>Ensure that the identified bioactive compounds and their mechanisms of action are correctly interpreted and linked to the pharmacological effects discussed.</p> <p>4. Consistency in Claims:</p> <p>Cross-check all claims, especially those related to pharmacological activities like anti-inflammatory, hypoglycemic, and antimicrobial effects, to ensure they are substantiated by the studies referenced.</p> <p>5. Quantitative Data Inclusion:</p> <p>If possible, include quantitative data (e.g., IC50 values for antioxidant activity or effective dose ranges) to provide stronger scientific grounding.</p> <p>6. Scope for Further Research:</p> <p>If not already addressed, identify gaps in the current understanding of Ficus exasperata to suggest areas for future exploration.</p> <p>With these considerations, the manuscript would be scientifically robust and more impactful. Let me know if you'd like detailed guidance on any specific section.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references appear relevant, but ensure they include recent studies (past 5–7 years) on Ficus exasperata . Consider adding more references on toxicology, pharmacological mechanisms, and recent advancements in related phytochemical research for comprehensive coverage.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication, but minor improvements in grammar and phrasing could enhance readability and precision.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Thirunahari Ugandhar
Department, University & Country	Kakatiya University Warangal Kakatiya Govt College (A), India