

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_130087
Title of the Manuscript:	A Systematic Review on Neuroprotective Effects of Catalpol in Acute Focal Ischemic Stroke and Their Possible Mechanisms
Type of the Article	Review Article

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)
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.	This manuscript addresses a critical research gap by systematically reviewing the neuroprotective effects of Catalpol in experimental ischemic stroke models. It provides an overview of mechanisms such as antioxidative, anti-inflammatory, and angiogenic effects, which are pivotal for developing effective stroke treatments. The emphasis on preclinical animal models bridges translational challenges in stroke therapeutics and highlights the need for further high-quality studies in this domain.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it accurately reflects the focus and scope of the manuscript.	
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 comprehensive and summarizes key findings well. However, more explicit mention of methodological limitations and variability in outcomes could improve balance. Suggest the addition of a sentence acknowledging methodological concerns.	As per the suggestion, a concise line regarding the methodological flaws has been added.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically robust, with a clear systematic review methodology adhering to PRISMA guidelines. There are some methodological concerns with the included studies, such as the absence of allocation concealment, lack of blinding, and inadequate sample size calculations. These should be emphasized further in the discussion.	As per the suggestion, correction made.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and relevant. Suggested addition include recent studies or meta-analyses on neuroprotective compounds for stroke to provide broader context.	As per the suggestion, recent studies focusing neuroprotection has been added.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear and scholarly. However, minor grammatical errors (e.g., subject-verb agreement) should be addressed.	Minor grammatical improvements have been made.
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript is a valuable contribution to the literature, but more discussion is needed on the translational gap between preclinical findings and clinical application. Limitations regarding the heterogeneity of animal models and neurobehavioral scoring methods could be expanded upon.</p> <p>The manuscript is well-structured and provides valuable insights into Catalpol's neuroprotective mechanisms. Minor revisions are required to address language quality, methodological critique, and expansion on translational challenges.</p>	Limitation regarding heterogeneity of animal models and neurobehavioral scoring methods has be expanded upon.

Review Form 3

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>	