

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Plant Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_128598
Title of the Manuscript:	Securidaca longipedunculata as a remedy against many physiopathology: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis from traditional use to scientific research
Type of the Article	Review Article

#### **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>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	✓ Medicinal plants are significant in contemporary health care and society, offering natural alternatives, bridging cultural practices with modern medicine, and continuing to contribute to pharmaceutical research and global health initiatives. Their relevance is increasing as more individuals and communities seek natural and sustainable health solutions. So it enables the scientific community to look in to other side of such plants basing the existing knowledge.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	✓ Quit enough	
<b>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.</b>	✓ Too shallow compared to the review finding. So better to include some more new points particularly on new areas of use emanating from differences in culture, religion etc.. among different countries	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	✓ As a review paper it is pretty enough	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	✓ Most of the references are outdate and I recommend a reference to be not more than 15 yrs. since its publication unless and otherwise obligatory to use it because of data deficiency	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	✓ Pretty good language usage	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Dereje Mosissa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute, Ethiopia</b>