

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 provides a comprehensive overview of the current preclinical evidence on the neuroprotective effects of Catalpol in animal models of acute focal ischemic stroke. By systematically reviewing and analyzing existing data, the authors contribute to a better understanding of Catalpol's potential therapeutic benefits in stroke. This information can guide future research efforts, such as preclinical studies investigating optimal dosing and administration routes, as well as clinical trials to evaluate the safety and efficacy of Catalpol in human stroke patients. Furthermore, this review highlights the need for rigorous methodological standards in preclinical stroke research to improve the translation of findings into clinical practice.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It clearly and concisely conveys the main focus of the review.	
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>The provided abstract is generally comprehensive, but it could be improved with a few additions:</p> <p>1. Explicitly state the research question:</p> <p>Instead of just stating the aim, explicitly mention the research question: "This study aims to systematically review the evidence on the neuroprotective effects of Catalpol in animal models of acute focal ischemic stroke and to determine its potential mechanisms of action."</p> <p>2. Briefly mention the quality assessment:</p> <p>A concise statement about the quality assessment of the included studies should be included. For example: "Methodological quality of the included studies was assessed using the CAMARADES checklist."</p>	As per the suggestion, modifications have been made in the abstract column.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript provides a foundation for understanding the potential neuroprotective effects of Catalpol in ischemic stroke. However, a more rigorous assessment of risk of bias, a deeper analysis of the data, and a more comprehensive discussion of limitations are necessary to strengthen the scientific validity and impact of the work.	As per the suggestion, corrections have been made in the manuscript.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<p>The reference list appears to include studies from 2010 to 2022, which is a good starting point. However, to ensure the review is up-to-date, I recommend including more recent publications (within the last 5 years).</p> <p>Additionally, the reference list should be carefully reviewed for completeness and accuracy. It would be beneficial to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Key Reviews: Other relevant systematic reviews and meta-analyses on stroke, neuroprotection, and the use of herbal medicines.	As per the suggestion, necessary correction have been made in the reference section and also updating its accuracy and completeness.

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Guidelines: Relevant guidelines and recommendations from organizations like the American Heart Association (AHA) and the Stroke Council on the management of stroke.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<div>. <input type="checkbox"/> Section 2.3: Provide details on the assessment tool used for methodological quality assessment of the studies.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Section 3.1: Report the number of studies excluded after applying each inclusion/exclusion criteria.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Section 3.3: Create tables to present data on study characteristics like animal species, ischemic models, dosage of Catalpol, outcome measures etc.</div> <div><input type="checkbox"/> Consider mentioning future directions for research, such as the need for clinical trials to evaluate the efficacy of Catalpol in stroke patients.</div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The assessment tool used for methodological quality assessment of the studies has already been included in the section 2.3.The necessary corrections have been made, repoting the number of studies excluded during each screening process.The future directions for research has been added in the conclusion section.

PART 2:

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