

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 <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.	This systematic review is of immense clinical relevance because of the global burden of stroke and the limited availability of effective neuroprotective treatments. This review consolidates evidence from preclinical studies, addressing a significant translational gap, and offers insights into the therapeutic potential of Catalpol in acute focal ischemic stroke. This is a vital resource for researchers who are seeking novel therapies since it encompasses antioxidative, anti-inflammatory, and anti-apoptotic effects in various mechanistic pathways.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate because it reflects the scope and focus of the study clearly. The suggestion would be "Neuroprotective Effects of Catalpol in Acute Ischemic Stroke: A Systematic Review of Mechanisms." If a shorter titled is preferred.	
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 very informative, summarizing the objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions. However, it could be more informative by providing details on the databases used, the time frame of the study search, and a brief mention of the methodological limitations to give a balanced overview.	As per you suggestion, we have included the databases from which the relevant studies were isolated in abstract column. And the time period for study is also included.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	It is a scientifically valid manuscript with comprehensive synthesis of the available preclinical studies on the neuroprotective effects of Catalpol. The rigor applied in using inclusion and exclusion criteria ensures that only relevant studies have been analyzed; however, the different quality and methodological inconsistencies among included studies would have to be highlighted more aptly in the discussion.	Suggestion noted, but we have already included the relevant limitation in the limitation column following the discussion column.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are appropriate and contain relevant and recent studies. However, more citations of global studies or meta-analyses on ischemic stroke neuroprotection would make the manuscript stronger.	Yes, we have altered the references as per the suggestion.

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for scholarly communication, with clear and precise phrasing. Minor grammatical improvements and consistency in terminology (e.g., NFS, IV) could enhance readability.	We have done grammatical improvements.
Optional/General comments	<p>The flow chart summarizing study selection is well-structured, but adding a brief explanation in the text would improve accessibility.</p> <p>Expanding the limitations section to address potential publication bias due to the predominance of studies in Chinese would enhance transparency.</p> <p>The discussion may include suggestions for clinical translation, including standardization of the dose and the timing of administration of Catalpol.</p> <p>The limitations section requires expansion to discuss publication bias and the predominance of studies in Chinese.</p> <p>The manuscript lacks explicit disclosure of competing interests, which should be addressed to ensure transparency.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>We have now added a precise explanation of the flow chart in the text column to improve readers understanding.</p> <p>The given correction is added in the limitation column.</p> <p>The competing interests column has been added as per your suggestion.</p>

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	