

**Issues on 10.1371/journal.pone.0328913**

An investigation suggests several integrity issues on the article [1]:

**(1) The authorship is problematic.**

The article [1] is about the applications of herb plants in a Pakistan community. Authors claim they collected the herb plants in the community, and interviewed with the local residents. However, three researchers from China are listed as the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup> authors of the article. Those three Chinese authors hardly got involved in such practices.

The funding sources for this article [1] were solely from China, and they are irrelevant to the research reported on the article. According to a document [2] received by the 5GH Team, the funding "JGJX2023D839" acknowledged in the article is about "Research on the Characteristic Construction of Application-Oriented Undergraduate Institutions in Jilin Province from the Perspective of the Educational Ecosystem in the Digital Age" (translated from Chinese "数字化时代教育生态视域下吉林省应用型本科院校特色建设研"). And the second funding is "Research on the Application of Stable Diffusion in Landscape Architecture Design in the AI Era".

These suggest that the three Chinese likely purchased the authorship via an unknown measure.

**(2) Abnormal patterns are identified in the data on several tables.**

On Table 3, the UV values are exclusively to be 0.8 and 0.6, except for a "0.86" and a "0.66". While on Table 4, The FL (%) values are exclusively to be 80 and 60, except for a "66".

10.1371/journal.pone.0328913

5GH Foundation

## Table 3 and 4: Abnormal Data Patterns

Table 3. Use value (UV).

Plant Species	Family	UV
<i>Albizia lebbbeck</i> (L.) Benth.	Fabaceae	0.8
<i>Azadirachta indica</i> A. Juss.	Meliaceae	0.6
<i>Bauhinia variegata</i> L.	Fabaceae	0.8
<i>Cordia myxa</i> L.	Boraginaceae	0.6
<i>Dalbergia sissoo</i> DC.	Fabaceae	0.6
<i>Eucalyptus globulus</i> Labill.	Myrtaceae	0.86
<i>Ficus religiosa</i> L.	Moraceae	0.6
<i>Fraxinus ornus</i> L.	Oleaceae	0.6
<i>Laurus nobilis</i> L.	Rubaceae	0.6
<i>Melia azedarach</i> L.	Fabaceae	0.6
<i>Moringa oleifera</i> Lam.	Moringaceae	0.6
<i>Morus alba</i> L.	Moraceae	0.6
<i>Olea europaea</i> L.	Oleaceae	0.6
<i>Phoenix dactylefera</i> L.	Arecaceae	0.66
<i>Prosopis cineraria</i> (L.) Druce	Fabaceae	0.6
<i>Senegalia catechu</i> (L.f.) P.J.H. Hurter & Mabb.	Fabaceae	0.6
<i>Tamarix aphylla</i> (L.) H.Karst.	Tamaricaceae	0.6
<i>Terminalia arjuna</i> (Roxb. ex DC.) Wight & Arn.	Combaceae	0.6
<i>Vachellia nilotica</i> (L.) P.J.H. Hurter & Mabb.	Fabaceae	0.8
<i>Ziziphus jujube</i> Mill.	Rhamnaceae	0.8

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0328913.t003>

Table 4. Fidelity level (FL %) values of plant species based on ethnomedicinal use.

Plant Species	Family	Diseases treated	FL %
<i>Albizia lebbbeck</i> (L.) Benth.	Fabaceae	Stomach diseases	60
<i>Azadirachta indica</i> A. Juss.	Meliaceae	Stomach diseases	60
<i>Bauhinia variegata</i> L.	Fabaceae	Skin diseases	60
<i>Cordia myxa</i> L.	Boraginaceae	Liver diseases	60
<i>Dalbergia sissoo</i> DC.	Fabaceae	Liver diseases	60
<i>Eucalyptus globulus</i> Labill.	Myrtaceae	Skin diseases	86
<i>Ficus religiosa</i> L.	Moraceae	Diarhea	60
<i>Fraxinus ornus</i> L.	Oleaceae	Diarhea	66
<i>Laurus nobilis</i> L.	Rubaceae	Skin diseases	60
<i>Melia azedarach</i> L.	Fabaceae	Stomach diseases	60
<i>Moringa oleifera</i> Lam.	Moringaceae	Stomach diseases	60
<i>Morus alba</i> L.	Moraceae	Liver diseases	60
<i>Olea europaea</i> L.	Oleaceae	Stomach diseases	60
<i>Phoenix dactylefera</i> L.	Arecaceae	Stomach diseases	60
<i>Prosopis cineraria</i> (L.) Druce	Fabaceae	Stomach diseases	60
<i>Senegalia catechu</i> (L.f.) P.J.H. Hurter & Mabb.	Fabaceae	Stomach diseases	60
<i>Tamarix aphylla</i> (L.) H. Karst.	Tamaricaceae	Liver diseases	60
<i>Terminalia arjuna</i> (Roxb. ex DC.) Wight & Arn.	Combaceae	Anti-inflammatory	60
<i>Vachellia nilotica</i> (L.) P.J.H. Hurter & Mabb.	Fabaceae	Liver diseases	80
<i>Ziziphus jujube</i> Mill.	Rhamnaceae	Anti-inflammatory	60

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0328913.t004>

On Table 1, sum of the numbers with different "Educational Background" is 311, exceed to the total number (300) of the participants interviewed by the authors.

Table 1. Socio-demographic data of informants.

Variation	Category	Number	Percentage
Gender	Male	257	85%
	Female	43	14%
Age	30-40	84	28%
	41-50	159	53%
	51-60	41	13%
	Above 60	9	3%
Occupation	Farmer	148	49%
	Pansar	8	2%
	Herbalist	22	7%
	Others	122	40%
Educational Background	Illiterate	74	24%
	Primary	159	53%
	Middle	37	12%
	Matric	33	11%
	Above Matric	8	2%

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0328913.t001>

311 of 300  
participants

[1] 10.1371/journal.pone.0328913

[2] [http://www.jlgjxh.com.cn/uploads/soft/230619/5\\_1548324701.pdf](http://www.jlgjxh.com.cn/uploads/soft/230619/5_1548324701.pdf)

---

This article is licensed to the 5GH Foundation under a CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 International License.