

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
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>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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>	<p><i>Comment 1:</i> The title, "Securidaca longipedunculata as a remedy against many physiopathology," is slightly ambiguous. Consider revising for specificity, such as "<i>Pharmacological Potential of Securidaca longipedunculata: A Comprehensive Review of Traditional and Scientific Insights.</i>" This will align better with the systematic nature of the review.</p> <p><i>Comment 2:</i> The abstract does not clearly state the significance of the updated meta-analysis. It would benefit from a brief mention of how this work advances existing knowledge or addresses a specific research gap.</p> <p><i>Comment 3:</i> While the historical context is engaging, the introduction could be more concise. Streamlining this section to focus on the importance of Securidaca longipedunculata in traditional and modern medicine would improve reader engagement.</p> <p><i>Comment 4:</i> The methodology lacks details about inclusion/exclusion criteria for studies and how the data was analyzed. Adding this information would strengthen the systematic nature of the review.</p> <p><i>Comment 5:</i> Tables summarizing the pharmacological activities (e.g., Table 2) are well-constructed. However, the discussion accompanying these results could better highlight key trends and areas needing further research.</p> <p><i>Comment 6:</i> The toxicological studies are presented effectively, but it would be valuable to include a comparative analysis or a chart summarizing toxicity thresholds across different studies for quick reference.</p> <p><i>Comment 7:</i> The conclusion is broad, stating that the plant has pharmacological potential but requires further research. Adding specific recommendations, such as which pharmacological activities warrant more investigation, would make it more impactful.</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>Cite following articles in your work</p> <p>http://ibb.kpi.ua/article/view/296662</p> <p>https://jptcp.com/index.php/jptcp/article/view/4324</p> <p>https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39396428/</p> <p>https://www.jptcp.com/index.php/jptcp/article/view/4689</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, read comment 1.	
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.	Check comment 2.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<p>Add these references</p> <p>http://ibb.kpi.ua/article/view/296662</p> <p>https://jptcp.com/index.php/jptcp/article/view/4324</p> <p>https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39396428/</p> <p>https://www.jptcp.com/index.php/jptcp/article/view/4689</p>	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	The overall work is good, I recommend it for publication after minor revision.	

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:	Muhammad Nouman Majeed
Department, University & Country	University of Central Punjab, Pakistan