

Pharmacognostical & Phytochemical Evaluation of Giloy Leaves

Shubham Mallick and Gulafsha Parveen

Guru Nanak College of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Dehradun

Abstract: *Tinospora cordifolia* (Willd.) Hook. f. and Thomson, commonly called Giloy or Guduchi, is a climbing medicinal plant in the family Menispermaceae. Although the plant has a long history in Ayurveda and a large body of research addresses the species as a whole, the evidence base for leaves must be evaluated separately from the much more frequently studied stem. This review examines the pharmacognostical identity, macroscopic and microscopic features, powder characters, physicochemical evaluation, preliminary phytochemical screening, chromatographic profiling, and analytical opportunities for *T. cordifolia* leaves. A focused literature search was used to identify leaf-specific and comparative studies, including a detailed pharmacognostic investigation that described anomocytic stomata, unicellular trichomes, a dorsiventral lamina, and seasonal physicochemical variation, as well as recent work on ultrasound-assisted extraction and LC–MS/MS profiling of leaf and stem extracts. The available literature supports the value of leaves as a distinct botanical material containing measurable primary and secondary metabolites, including phenolic and flavonoid-associated constituents. However, the presence of a compound in a whole-plant or stem extract cannot be assumed to establish its presence, concentration, or pharmacological relevance in leaves. Likewise, qualitative colour tests are preliminary indicators and do not replace compound confirmation by validated instrumental methods. This review outlines an evidence-conscious workflow for leaf authentication and standardization, covering botanical voucher documentation, microscopy, moisture and ash measurements, extractive values, chromatographic fingerprints, quantitative marker analysis, and contaminant testing. Important limitations include the relatively small number of detailed leaf-only pharmacognostic studies, inconsistent reporting of collection season and extraction conditions, and a lack of widely adopted leaf-specific acceptance limits. A standardized, voucher-linked and analytically validated approach is needed to improve reproducibility, prevent substitution or adulteration, and support future research on Giloy leaves.

Keywords: *Tinospora cordifolia*; Giloy; Guduchi; leaf pharmacognosy; leaf microscopy; phytochemical screening; HPTLC; LC–MS/MS; herbal standardization.

I. INTRODUCTION

Medicinal plants remain important sources of traditional remedies and of chemical scaffolds investigated in contemporary pharmacological research. Their use, however, depends on more than a history of traditional application. Correct botanical identity, a defined plant part, controlled processing, reproducible chemical composition, and appropriate safety evaluation are all needed if a botanical material is to be studied and compared reliably. Pharmacognosy provides the tools to authenticate crude plant drugs using macroscopic, microscopic, physicochemical and chemical characteristics, while phytochemical evaluation helps describe the chemical groups present and, where suitable analytical methods are available, quantify selected constituents [1,2].

Giloy, commonly known as Guduchi or Amrita, is *Tinospora cordifolia* (Willd.) Hook. f. and Thomson, a member of the Menispermaceae. It is a perennial climbing plant used in several Indian traditional systems. Modern reviews describe a chemically diverse species, with reports of alkaloids, diterpenoids, glycosides, phenolic compounds, steroids,



polysaccharides and other constituents [3-6]. These reviews are valuable for understanding the wider species, but their summaries often combine results from stems, roots, aerial parts, whole-plant material, or preparations whose plant-part identity is not always comparable. A review focused on leaves therefore needs a narrower evidence rule: only results directly obtained from leaves should be described as leaf-specific.

The distinction matters practically. Stem is the most prominent crude-drug part in many commercial Guduchi preparations and has received extensive attention in pharmacognostic and phytochemical work. Leaf tissue differs anatomically from stem tissue and may also differ in metabolite distribution, water content, extractability and susceptibility to environmental effects. Results from stem powder—such as stem transverse-section features or stem-specific ash and extractive values—cannot be used as leaf specifications. Even when a study analyses multiple plant parts, each result should be assigned to the relevant part rather than generalized to the entire species [1,7].

Choudhary and colleagues examined leaves, stems and aerial roots collected in different seasons and reported leaf characteristics including a broadly ovate to roundish cordate blade, anomocytic stomata, unicellular trichomes, reticulate venation and a dorsiventral mesophyll. Their study also compared several physicochemical and phytochemical parameters among the investigated plant parts [1]. This paper is particularly relevant because it documents leaf features in a comparative framework. More recent research has investigated leaf extracts using ultrasound-assisted extraction, antioxidant and antimicrobial assays, and LC–MS/MS-based profiling [7]. A separate review discusses proposed immunomodulatory applications of Giloy leaves and leaf-containing products, while also emphasizing the need for further evidence [8].

The aim of this review is to critically synthesize published information on pharmacognostical and phytochemical evaluation of *T. cordifolia* leaves. The objectives are to describe leaf identity and diagnostic anatomy; review relevant physicochemical and preliminary phytochemical methods; summarize leaf-specific chemical profiling evidence; distinguish direct findings from broader species-level claims; and identify practical steps needed for reproducible leaf standardization. The review does not claim to have performed new laboratory analyses, and it does not treat pharmacological claims for stem or whole-plant preparations as proof of equivalent effects from leaf preparations.

II. REVIEW APPROACH AND EVIDENCE BOUNDARIES

A focused narrative literature search was undertaken using PubMed, PubMed Central, publisher pages and searchable scholarly records. Search concepts included combinations of *Tinospora cordifolia*, Giloy, Guduchi, leaves, leaf microscopy, pharmacognostic evaluation, physicochemical parameters, phytochemical screening, HPTLC, GC–MS, LC–MS/MS, antioxidant activity and immunomodulatory properties. Priority was given to primary studies that explicitly identified leaves as the material tested, comparative studies that reported results separately by plant part, and reviews that specifically addressed leaves. Broader species reviews were used for context and for locating references, but species-level or stem-only statements were not recast as leaf-specific findings [1,3-8].

This approach is a focused narrative review rather than a registered systematic review. No formal risk-of-bias scoring or quantitative meta-analysis was undertaken. Study designs, extraction procedures, analytical platforms and endpoints vary, and the available evidence is too heterogeneous for meaningful pooled estimates. A complete systematic review would require reproducible database-specific search strings, duplicate screening by independent reviewers, a documented flow diagram, and formal critical appraisal. The present article instead prioritizes transparent interpretation and clear labeling of evidence.

2.1 Evidence categories used in this review

Leaf-specific evidence: a study explicitly reports results from *T. cordifolia* leaves or leaf-derived extract.

Comparative evidence: a study examines leaves together with stem, aerial root or another part and reports observations by part. Species-level or indirect evidence: a review or study discusses *T. cordifolia* without reliably assigning a finding to leaves. Such information is used only as context and is not treated as proof of leaf composition.



Botanical names and plant-part terms are retained as reported in the source. Older papers may use a different author citation for the species name; the name *Tinospora cordifolia* is used consistently here for readability. Because online indexing and publication metadata can contain minor discrepancies, readers should verify bibliographic details and full methods from the original article before using the data for a regulatory specification or experimental protocol.

III. BOTANICAL IDENTITY AND LEAF MORPHOLOGY

3.1 Taxonomic position and authentication

T. cordifolia belongs to the family Menispermaceae and is a climbing plant with slender to robust stems and simple leaves. Common names such as Giloy, Giloe and Guduchi are useful in traditional and commercial communication but are not sufficient for scientific authentication. Common names may be applied inconsistently, and related *Tinospora* species can be confused in supply chains. Authentication should therefore combine a taxonomically identified specimen, diagnostic morphology, and a traceable voucher specimen deposited in a recognized herbarium or institutional collection. The collector, collection location, date, habitat, developmental stage and name of the identifier should be recorded [3,4,6].

For a leaf-focused study, a voucher should ideally include representative leaves attached to a stem segment so that the leaf can be assessed in relation to the plant. If flowers or fruits are available, they may strengthen taxonomic confirmation, but the analytical sample itself should be documented as leaf material. Photographs of the source plant, upper and lower leaf surfaces, petiole, node and collection site can provide useful supporting documentation. Molecular identification may be considered when morphology is ambiguous, although DNA barcoding complements rather than replaces pharmacognostic examination and cannot by itself establish chemical quality.

3.2 Macroscopic characters

In the comparative pharmacognostic study by Choudhary et al., the leaves were described as simple, alternate and exstipulate, with a broadly ovate to roundish, cordate lamina. The reported leaf blade measured approximately 5–12 cm in diameter. The upper surface was described as glaucous and the lower surface as somewhat paler; the apex was acute or sharply acuminate, and the base had a broad sinus. The leaves were intensely green in bulk, while older leaves could appear yellowish green to yellow. The taste was described as bitter and the odour as indistinct [1]. These observations are useful descriptive references, not universal limits: leaf dimensions, colour and texture can vary with maturity, growing conditions, water availability and handling.

The petiole was reported as slender and relatively long, approximately 3–9 cm, with a pulvinate base and slight twisting at the base [1]. During incoming-material inspection, the petiole and the shape of the leaf base may help distinguish authentic material from fragments of unrelated leaves. A practical macroscopic assessment should record lamina shape, base, apex, margin, venation, surface features, colour on both sides, petiole characteristics, odour and taste where appropriate. Taste testing is not essential for routine authentication and should never be performed on material of uncertain identity or contamination status.

Macroscopic characters are inexpensive and rapid, making them a first-line quality check. Their limitation is that dried, fragmented or powdered material loses many of the visible diagnostic features. Colour is particularly unreliable when material has been stored in direct light, exposed to humidity or dried at high temperatures. For this reason, visual inspection should be integrated with microscopy and chemical profiling rather than used as the only identity test.

3.3 Leaf anatomy and microscopy

Microscopy can support authentication when external features are incomplete or when the material is supplied as cut leaves or powder. Choudhary et al. reported a dorsiventral lamina in which the mesophyll was differentiated into palisade and spongy tissues. The palisade layer was described as a single row of thin-walled columnar cells occupying a little more than half the mesophyll width in the specimens examined. The midrib cross-section was slightly convex on the upper side, with a broad lower projection and a well-developed median collateral vascular bundle [1]. These



observations describe the examined material and should be checked in independent collections before being adopted as a universal diagnostic template.

The same study reported angular epidermal cells in surface view, anomocytic stomata and unicellular trichomes. Reported stomatal density was approximately 200–600 per mm², with stomata about 36–54 µm long and 18–36 µm wide. Trichomes were reported at approximately 1–4 per mm² and measured around 115–145 µm in length and 32–42 µm in width. The reported epidermal-cell density was approximately 1000–1500 per mm²; vein-islet number was 1–3 per mm² and vein-termination number 6–16 per mm² [1]. These values should be treated as study-specific observations, not as official acceptance limits. Differences in leaf surface, sampling position, maturity, preparation technique, magnification and counting method can influence microscopic measurements.

Reticulate venation with prominent principal veins was described, with the veins more evident on the lower surface. The petiole transverse section was reported to have a single-layered epidermis, a broad cortical zone, an endodermal layer, several layers of fibrous pericycle, a ring of vascular bundles and a broad central parenchymatous pith [1]. In routine quality control, leaf and petiole microscopy should be distinguished from stem anatomy. The characteristic wheel-like or radiating vascular appearance often discussed for Guduchi stem is not a leaf diagnostic feature and should not be copied into a leaf monograph.

3.4 Powder microscopy

Powder microscopy becomes important when leaves are dried and milled for extraction, capsules or blended herbal products. The preparation should be sufficiently fine for light microscopy but not so aggressively milled that all recognizable structures are destroyed. Suitable mounts and clearing agents can help reveal epidermal fragments, stomata, trichomes, fragments of lamina, vascular tissue, fibres and crystals where present. The interpretation should rely on a combination of characters rather than on one isolated fragment. A reference slide set prepared from authenticated leaves can improve analyst consistency.

Powder microscopy is best documented with calibrated images, scale bars and a record of the preparation method. Each claimed diagnostic structure should be supported by an image from the examined sample. Since a leaf powder may contain petiole fragments, minor vascular elements should not automatically be interpreted as contamination. Conversely, the presence of abundant foreign fibres, unusual epidermal patterns or structures inconsistent with the authenticated

reference should prompt further investigation. Powder microscopy is not a quantitative substitute for chemical analysis, but it is an economical tool for detecting gross substitution and for supporting identity testing.

3.5 Histochemical localization

Histochemical staining can help localize broad chemical classes within tissues. Reagents for starch, lipids, phenolics, tannins or mucilage may provide useful preliminary evidence when interpreted with appropriate positive and negative controls. A colour response indicates a reaction under the test conditions; it does not establish the exact molecular identity of a constituent. For example, a general phenolic reaction cannot prove the presence of a specific flavonoid, and a starch stain does not identify the carbohydrate structure. Histochemistry should therefore be used as a complementary anatomical method, with compound-specific claims reserved for validated chemical methods.

IV. COLLECTION, PROCESSING AND SAMPLE PREPARATION

4.1 Collection and traceability

Leaf chemistry can be affected by genotype, climate, soil, light exposure, water stress, season, plant age, disease, herbivory and the time of collection. Studies intended to establish reference values should therefore use authenticated plants from documented locations and should state the collection season and developmental stage. Where feasible, several plants should be sampled to represent biological variation rather than collecting all leaves from one individual.



Replicate samples should be retained separately until between-plant variation has been assessed. Pooling may be appropriate for a composite sample, but it can hide variability and should be justified.

Leaves should be separated from stem fragments and visibly diseased, insect-damaged or contaminated material. Washing, if required, should be described because it may remove surface material and can alter water content; excessive soaking may cause leaching of water-soluble constituents. Samples should be transported in clean, labelled containers and protected from direct sunlight and excessive heat. The sample identifier should connect the botanical voucher, collection record, drying batch, powder batch, extract and analytical files.

4.2 Drying, milling and storage

Drying reduces water activity and helps limit microbial deterioration, but it can also change sensitive constituents. Shade drying, controlled hot-air drying and freeze-drying have different costs and effects on processing time, colour, enzyme activity and extractability. There is no single drying temperature that can be assumed optimal for every intended marker. The chosen method should be reported with temperature, duration, sample thickness, airflow and final moisture or loss-on-drying result. A preliminary comparison of drying conditions may be needed when the goal is quantitative marker analysis.

After drying, leaves can be milled and passed through a defined sieve. Particle size influences solvent contact and extraction efficiency; it should therefore be kept consistent when comparing batches. Powder should be stored in airtight, light-protective containers under defined temperature and humidity conditions. Labels should include species, plant part, batch number, date, drying conditions and storage status. Moisture uptake during storage can affect ash calculations, extraction yield and microbial risk, so samples should be equilibrated or tested according to a documented procedure before analysis.

4.3 Extraction strategy

Extraction is not a neutral step: the solvent and operating conditions select which constituents are recovered. Water tends to extract many polar constituents, while aqueous alcohol can recover a broader mixture of moderately polar compounds; non-polar solvents favour lipophilic constituents. A phytochemical profile is therefore inseparable from its extraction method. Studies should report plant-to-solvent ratio, solvent composition, extraction time, temperature, agitation or sonication, number of extraction cycles, filtration and concentration method, and whether yield is calculated on dry or fresh starting material.

Choudhary et al. prepared methanolic extracts for thin-layer chromatographic comparison using repeated extraction and a specified chloroform–methanol–water mobile phase [1]. A more recent study optimized ultrasound-assisted extraction conditions for Giloy leaf and stem extracts and used LC–MS/MS to investigate selected compounds [7]. These approaches demonstrate the value of documenting extraction conditions, but results from different solvent systems should not be compared as if they represent identical chemical fractions. Methanol is useful in laboratory analysis but is not automatically an appropriate solvent for products intended for consumption; solvent choice must fit the research objective and applicable safety requirements.

V. PHYSICOCHEMICAL EVALUATION OF LEAVES

5.1 Moisture content and loss on drying

Moisture-related measurements help assess drying efficiency and the likelihood of deterioration during storage. Loss on drying measures the mass lost under specified conditions and may include water as well as other volatile substances. A moisture-specific method, such as a suitable Karl Fischer procedure, may be more appropriate when water must be distinguished from other volatiles. The method, sample mass, temperature, duration and endpoint must be stated. Results should be expressed on a clearly defined basis and replicated.

In the seasonal comparative study of *T. cordifolia* plant parts, total moisture values reported for leaves varied from approximately 1.23% to 6.01% across the samples and seasons examined [1]. This range illustrates that reported values



are linked to the sampling and processing conditions in a particular study. It should not be copied as a universal specification or used to accept/reject a commercial leaf batch without validation. A laboratory establishing a local reference range should test multiple authenticated batches and determine an acceptance limit suited to the material and intended storage conditions.

5.2 Ash values

Total ash estimates the inorganic residue remaining after incineration. Acid-insoluble ash provides an indication of siliceous matter, such as soil or sand, while water-soluble ash estimates the portion of total ash soluble in water under the specified method. These tests are useful for detecting excessive extraneous mineral matter and for describing a crude drug, but they are not specific for botanical identity. Soil composition, washing, collection practices and incineration conditions can all affect the result.

Leaf-specific ash values should be obtained directly from authenticated leaf samples. Values reported for stems or aerial roots must not be substituted because the tissue types and their mineral composition may differ. For reproducibility, a report should specify sample drying, incineration temperature, time, crucible handling, cooling in a desiccator and calculation basis. If an unusual ash result is observed, the investigation should include sample handling and possible soil contamination rather than assuming that the species itself is abnormal.

5.3 Extractive values

Water-soluble and alcohol-soluble extractive values estimate the amount of material extracted by defined solvents under pharmacopoeial conditions. They are broad indices of extractable constituents and may help compare batches processed by the same method. They do not measure a specific active compound and cannot be used alone to infer potency. Solvent composition, particle size, drying and extraction time must be held constant for meaningful comparisons.

For Giloy leaves, extractive values should be established from leaf material rather than inferred from a stem monograph or from a whole-plant publication. A reference range should be developed using several authentic batches and should reflect the intended supply chain. A result outside the established range should trigger investigation of identity, moisture, particle size, storage, extraction method and possible adulteration. The result should not automatically be interpreted as evidence of therapeutic failure or superiority.

5.4 Foreign matter and contamination

Foreign matter assessment identifies visible material that does not belong to the defined crude drug, including unrelated plant parts, weeds, soil, insects and other extraneous matter. In a leaf-specific product, excessive stem fragments may be relevant even if they originate from the same species, because the intended plant part is part of the material specification. A validated sampling plan is important because contaminants may be distributed unevenly through a batch.

Modern herbal quality evaluation should also consider microbial limits, pesticide residues, elemental contaminants and mycotoxins where relevant to the source, processing and intended use. These are not pharmacognostic identity tests, but they are essential components of a quality system. Collection near roads, industrial sites or intensively treated agricultural land may introduce contaminants that cannot be detected by visual inspection. Testing should follow applicable pharmacopoeial, national or product-specific requirements and should use validated methods.

5.5 Fluorescence analysis

Fluorescence analysis observes the colour or fluorescence of powdered plant material under visible light and ultraviolet illumination, sometimes after treatment with selected reagents. It is inexpensive and can create a supporting profile for authenticated leaf powder. However, fluorescence is affected by reagent concentration, moisture, particle size, illumination wavelength and observation conditions. It should be reported as a comparative fingerprint rather than as an



independent proof of identity. A reference photograph and standardized lighting are recommended when this technique is used.

VI. PRELIMINARY PHYTOCHEMICAL SCREENING

Preliminary phytochemical screening applies group-level chemical reactions to an extract or powdered material to assess whether broad classes of constituents may be present. Commonly investigated groups include alkaloids, flavonoids, phenolics, tannins, saponins, glycosides, terpenoids, steroids, carbohydrates and proteins. Such screening is useful for deciding which analytical methods to pursue, but it has important limitations: tests may be non-specific, matrix colour can interfere, and a positive reaction does not identify an individual compound. Negative results may reflect an unsuitable solvent, low concentration, degradation or insufficient method sensitivity rather than true absence.

6.1 Alkaloids

Alkaloids are a prominent chemical class in the broader phytochemical literature on *T. cordifolia*. Reviews of the species discuss compounds such as berberine, palmatine, magnoflorine and related alkaloids, but many reports concern stem, root or material whose plant-part attribution needs checking [3-6]. For a leaf-focused review, an alkaloid should only be listed as confirmed in leaves when the cited primary study clearly reports leaf material and an appropriate analytical basis. A general precipitation test may suggest alkaloid-like substances, but it cannot identify berberine or quantify it.

Where alkaloids are a target, a suitable extraction and clean-up method followed by TLC/HPTLC, HPLC or LC-MS/MS can provide stronger evidence. Identification should use reference standards and appropriate retention-time, UV-spectrum or mass-spectral criteria. When a compound is only tentatively assigned by mass-spectral library matching, it should be described as putatively identified rather than conclusively confirmed. Quantification requires calibration, precision, accuracy, linearity, range, robustness and other validation characteristics appropriate to the method.

6.2 Phenolic compounds and flavonoids

Phenolic compounds and flavonoids are relevant targets because they are frequently investigated in plant extracts for their chemical diversity and antioxidant behaviour. Choudhary et al. reported comparatively higher flavonoid and phenolic content in leaves than in the stem and aerial root in their study [1]. This finding supports further investigation of leaf material, but it should be interpreted within the study's sampling, extraction and assay conditions. It does not establish a universal ranking for every cultivar, season, extraction solvent or growing location.

Total phenolic content is often estimated using the Folin-Ciocalteu reaction, while total flavonoid content may be estimated using aluminium chloride-based colourimetric methods. Both are operational assays rather than complete inventories of molecules. The Folin-Ciocalteu reagent can react with reducing substances other than phenolics, and aluminium chloride response varies among flavonoid structures. Results should be expressed against a stated reference standard, such as gallic acid equivalents or quercetin equivalents, and the calibration and calculation basis should be given. These assays are best used for batch comparison when extraction and analytical conditions are standardized.

Compound-level analysis can be conducted with HPLC-DAD, UHPLC or LC-MS/MS, depending on the target compounds and laboratory resources. The recent ultrasound-assisted extraction study reported several compounds, including catechin, malic acid, quercetin, kaempferol, ellagic acid, hesperidin and berberine in the analyzed Giloy extracts [7]. Since the study investigated both leaf and stem extracts, each compound should be attributed only according to the plant-part-specific data and analytical results in the full paper. A list in an abstract or a combined extract summary should not be assumed to mean that every listed compound was present in leaves at the same concentration.



6.3 Tannins

Tannins are polyphenolic constituents capable of binding proteins and other macromolecules. They may be assessed by group-level chemical reactions or quantitative assays, but the results depend on the method and the standard used. Choudhary et al. reported leaf material to have comparatively higher tannin content than the other parts examined [1]. This result is a useful comparative observation, but method-specific values should not be compared directly across papers without accounting for extraction solvent, calibration standard and sample basis. If tannins are proposed as quality markers, a more selective method and a justified acceptance range are required.

6.4 Glycosides and terpenoid-related compounds

Glycosides and terpenoid-related compounds are widely discussed in the phytochemistry of *T. cordifolia*. However, species-level reviews combine findings from different organs and sometimes from extracts not clearly described as leaf-only [3-6]. Therefore, a leaf evaluation should not assume that every known stem diterpenoid or glycoside is present in the leaves. Screening reactions can provide preliminary indications, but definitive assignment requires isolation or suitable chromatographic and spectrometric evidence. The distinction is particularly important when a compound is proposed as a marker for routine standardization.

6.5 Carbohydrates and starch

Leaves contain primary metabolites that may contribute to measured sugar and starch content. Choudhary et al. reported that the leaves in their comparative study had the highest sugar and starch content among the plant parts examined [1]. These results can be useful for understanding the material, but they do not by themselves indicate medicinal potency. Sugar and starch values are sensitive to maturity, season, drying and the analytical procedure. A study should report whether total, reducing or non-reducing sugars were measured and should specify the starch assay and calculation basis.

6.6 Interpretation of qualitative tests

A phytochemical table should state the plant part, solvent, test used, observation and interpretation. Entries such as “present” or “absent” without method details have limited value. A result should be marked “not reported” when the paper does not provide evidence, rather than converting missing data into a negative finding. If a reaction is weak or ambiguous, the correct interpretation is “inconclusive under the conditions used.” These reporting practices reduce overstatement and make the literature easier to compare.

VII. CHROMATOGRAPHIC AND INSTRUMENTAL PROFILING

7.1 Thin-layer chromatography and HPTLC

Thin-layer chromatography (TLC) separates extract components according to their interactions with a stationary phase and mobile phase. It can generate a rapid visual fingerprint, support comparison with reference materials and help detect gross batch differences. Choudhary et al. used methanolic extracts and TLC to compare plant parts and included berberine and tinosporaside as reference markers in their study [1]. The reported approach provides a useful historical example of chromatographic comparison, but the suitability of a particular marker for leaf-specific routine control should be demonstrated rather than assumed.

High-performance TLC (HPTLC) improves application precision and densitometric evaluation. A leaf-specific HPTLC method should define sample preparation, reference standards, plate type, mobile phase, chamber saturation, migration distance, derivatization reagent, detection wavelength and image-processing conditions. Fingerprints should be compared using replicate samples and authenticated reference batches. If a marker is selected, the method should show adequate specificity and repeatability. Similar-looking bands do not prove identical molecular composition, and a fingerprint alone is not a substitute for confirmatory analysis when identity or safety is in question.



7.2 HPLC and UHPLC

High-performance liquid chromatography can quantify selected non-volatile constituents when suitable standards and detection conditions are available. UV or diode-array detection is often appropriate for compounds with useful chromophores, while mass spectrometry can provide additional structural information. A method intended for quality control should define analyte selection based on evidence, not simply because a compound is frequently mentioned in general reviews of the species. For leaves, marker selection should account for detectability, stability, batch variation, analytical specificity and relevance to the material.

Validation should follow a recognized framework and include the characteristics needed for the method's purpose. Typical parameters include selectivity, calibration model, range, accuracy, repeatability, intermediate precision, detection and quantification limits where relevant, robustness and solution stability. System suitability should be established before batch testing. The validated method and its reference standards should be retained with the batch documentation. Without these controls, numerical results may be difficult to reproduce across laboratories.

7.3 LC-MS/MS and compound identification

Liquid chromatography coupled with tandem mass spectrometry can detect and characterize compounds across a wide range of polarities and concentrations. The 2025 study by Singh, Tripathy and Srivastav used ultrasound-assisted extraction and LC-MS/MS to investigate Giloy leaf and stem extracts and reported polyphenol-associated compounds among its findings [7]. The work is a useful advance because it combines extraction optimization with chemical and biological assessment. Nevertheless, the exact evidence for each individual leaf constituent should be taken from the full article's sample-specific results, not inferred from a combined list or from results reported for the stem.

Mass-spectral matching can yield tentative annotations, especially when authentic reference standards are not available. Confidence is strengthened by accurate mass, diagnostic fragmentation, retention behaviour, isotope pattern and comparison with reference compounds. Isomeric compounds may have similar spectra, so a library match alone can be insufficient. Publications should distinguish confirmed identification from putative annotation and should avoid presenting all LC-MS features as definitively identified chemicals. Quantitative claims require a validated quantitative method rather than relative peak intensity alone.

7.4 GC-MS and volatile or semi-volatile compounds

Gas chromatography-mass spectrometry is useful for volatile and semi-volatile constituents, including compounds in essential oils or extracts prepared with appropriate solvents. A species review reports that essential oil obtained from fresh

T. cordifolia leaves by hydrodistillation contained several broad chemical classes [5]. This type of result is relevant to leaf chemistry, but it should not be generalized to a non-volatile polar extract or to all dried leaf powders. Essential-oil composition can be influenced by plant condition, distillation conditions and instrument parameters.

GC-MS studies should report extraction or distillation method, sample mass, column and temperature programme, carrier gas, ionization conditions, library and match criteria, and whether identification was confirmed using standards or retention indices. Peak-area percentages are relative chromatographic responses and do not necessarily equal mass percentages in the original leaf. They should not be presented as absolute concentrations without an appropriate quantitative calibration.

7.5 FTIR and complementary methods

Fourier-transform infrared spectroscopy can provide a rapid profile of functional groups and may be useful for sample comparison, process monitoring or chemometric classification. However, FTIR bands generally do not identify a unique phytochemical in a complex botanical matrix. Its strongest role is often as a complementary fingerprinting technique combined with reference samples and validated statistical models. Spectral preprocessing, sample presentation, instrument settings and model validation should be documented.



Other useful approaches include nuclear magnetic resonance for structural elucidation and quantitative analysis, and DNA-based methods for botanical authentication. No single method answers every quality question. Microscopy addresses tissue identity, DNA methods address genetic identity, chromatographic methods address chemical profiles, and contaminant assays address safety-related impurities. A robust quality system combines complementary evidence in a way that matches the intended use.

VIII. LEAF-SPECIFIC PHYTOCHEMICAL EVIDENCE AND INTERPRETATION

The most directly relevant pharmacognostic evidence identified in this review is the comparative study by Choudhary et al. It documents leaf morphology and microscopy, seasonal sampling, physicochemical evaluation and phytochemical comparisons among leaves, stems and aerial roots [1]. The paper reported anomocytic stomata and unicellular trichomes in leaves and found higher levels of selected primary and secondary metabolite measures in leaves than in the other parts examined. The results make a strong case for treating leaves as a distinct material with its own identity and reference profile.

The recent study by Singh et al. is important because it examines leaf and stem extracts using ultrasound-assisted extraction, response-surface optimization and LC–MS/MS, alongside antioxidant and antimicrobial endpoints [7].

Optimization of solvent-to-solid ratio, sonication time and solvent concentration can improve extraction yield or selected assay responses, but an optimized extraction is optimized relative to chosen endpoints. It does not automatically mean that the extract is safest, most clinically effective or best for every marker. A process optimized for total phenolics may not recover the same profile as a process optimized for a particular alkaloid.

The review by Singh et al. on immunomodulatory properties and value-added products discusses possible leaf applications and pathways, including immune-related signalling and the incorporation of leaf material into food products [8]. Because it is a review, mechanistic and application statements should be traced back to the underlying primary studies when used in a scientific argument. In vitro antioxidant activity, an immune-cell assay, a food-product formulation and a clinical outcome represent different evidence levels. They should not be combined into a claim that leaf products have established therapeutic efficacy in humans.

Broader reviews of *T. cordifolia* describe extensive chemistry and a range of biological activities, including antioxidant, anti-inflammatory, metabolic and hepatoprotective effects [3-6]. These reviews are useful for understanding why the species is of interest, but they are not a substitute for organ-specific evidence. A constituent isolated from stem cannot be declared a leaf marker unless leaf-specific evidence supports it. Similarly, pharmacological activity observed with stem extract cannot be transferred to leaf extract without comparative testing. This is a central interpretive rule for the present topic.

8.1 Summary table of selected evidence

Source	Material/evidence	Relevant observations	Interpretive limit
Choudhary et al. [1]	Leaves, stem and aerial roots; comparative pharmacognosy	Leaf morphology, anomocytic stomata, Unicellular trichomes, dorsiventral lamina; selected metabolite measures compared across parts	Study-specific values; not universal acceptance limits
Singh et al. [7]	Ultrasound-assisted leaf and stem extracts; LC–MS/MS and bioassays	Extraction optimization and profiling of compounds in Giloy extracts	Use full paper to attribute each compound and assay result to a specific plant part
Singh et al. [8]	Review focused on leaves and value-added products	Summarizes proposed immunomodulatory relevance and product applications	Secondary source; claims should be traced to primary studies
Species-level reviews [3–6]	Whole plant and multiple plant parts	Broad chemical and pharmacological context	Do not treat stem/whole-plant reports as leaf-specific evidence



IX. A PRACTICAL WORKFLOW FOR STANDARDIZING GILOY LEAVES

A leaf-standardization programme should start with a written specification that defines the botanical source, plant part, acceptable condition and intended use. The workflow below is a proposed framework for future laboratory studies and quality systems; it is not a claim that official leaf-specific limits already exist for every parameter. Acceptance criteria should be established from authenticated batches and aligned with applicable pharmacopoeial and regulatory requirements.

9.1 Stage 1: Identity and voucher documentation

Confirm the botanical identity through a qualified taxonomist and retain a voucher specimen with a unique accession number.

Document collection location, date, season, plant maturity, habitat and collection method.

Photograph the whole source plant and both leaf surfaces, including apex, base, margin, petiole and venation. Keep leaf samples separate from stem and aerial-root material throughout processing.

9.2 Stage 2: Macroscopy and microscopy

Record leaf shape, base, apex, margin, colour, surface, petiole, odour and any relevant organoleptic properties. Prepare transverse sections of the lamina and midrib, and surface preparations from both leaf surfaces.

Measure stomata and trichomes using calibrated microscopy and a predefined sampling plan.

Develop a reference powder-microscopy atlas using authenticated material and include labelled micrographs.

9.3 Stage 3: Physicochemical parameters

Measure loss on drying or moisture using a defined method.

Determine total ash, acid-insoluble ash and water-soluble ash where appropriate.

Determine water-soluble and alcohol-soluble extractive values using standardized procedures.

Assess foreign matter and include contaminant testing appropriate to the source and intended product.

Each parameter should be tested in replicate and reported with the number of batches, variability and calculation basis.

A single batch is not enough to establish a robust specification. Initial development may use a broad set of authenticated samples from different seasons and locations; the final reference range should reflect the intended sourcing strategy and risk assessment.

9.4 Stage 4: Phytochemical fingerprint and marker selection

Begin with qualitative screening only as an exploratory step. Then select analytical methods based on the chemical classes that are reproducibly detected in leaf material. HPTLC may be suitable for routine fingerprint comparison, while HPLC or LC-MS/MS can support compound-level confirmation and quantification. Marker selection should be justified by leaf-specific evidence, analytical tractability, stability and reproducibility. A marker need not be assumed to be the sole active constituent; in many botanical materials, a multi-marker or fingerprint-based strategy is more realistic.

At least several independent authenticated batches should be profiled to identify normal chemical variation. Where possible, use a reference extract and certified or well-characterized chemical standards. A fingerprint similarity threshold should be developed using validation data rather than selected arbitrarily. If seasonal or geographic differences are substantial, the quality system should distinguish normal biological variation from adulteration or processing failure.

9.5 Stage 5: Method validation and ongoing control

Analytical procedures intended for release testing should be validated for their stated purpose. Sample stability, reference-standard traceability, system suitability, repeatability and robustness should be documented. Laboratories should retain chromatograms, raw data, calculations and deviations in a traceable system. If an out-of-specification result occurs, the investigation should first assess sampling, analyst technique, instrument performance, reagents and calculations before drawing a conclusion about the material. Repeated testing should not be used simply to obtain a passing result.



X. SAFETY, EFFICACY AND REGULATORY INTERPRETATION

Pharmacognostic and phytochemical evaluation is foundational to quality, but it does not establish clinical efficacy or safety. A leaf extract may show antioxidant activity in a chemical assay without producing a meaningful physiological effect in humans. Likewise, an in vitro antimicrobial result depends on concentration, solvent controls, assay design and organism, and cannot directly support a treatment recommendation. Evidence should be separated by level: chemical characterization, in vitro activity, animal studies, human observational evidence and controlled clinical trials. Species-level reviews discuss diverse pharmacological properties of *T. cordifolia*, but the plant part, extract composition, dose and formulation vary among studies [3-6]. Those differences limit extrapolation to leaf-only products. Before a leaf-based formulation is used therapeutically, the product should be chemically characterized and safety assessed for its intended route, dose, duration and population. Potential interactions, contraindications, contamination, misidentification and batch variation should be considered. Traditional use is an important research starting point, but it does not remove the need for evidence and quality control.

Regulatory classification depends on the country and on whether the product is marketed as a traditional medicine, food, supplement, cosmetic or pharmaceutical ingredient. Each category may have different requirements for identity, composition, contaminants, claims, manufacturing practices and clinical evidence. A review article should therefore avoid describing leaves as an approved treatment for a disease unless the claim is supported by appropriate jurisdiction-specific evidence. Product development should be guided by the applicable regulator and by qualified clinical and quality professionals.

XI. RESEARCH GAPS AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

11.1 Need for more leaf-only reference studies

Although a useful comparative pharmacognostic paper is available, the number of detailed leaf-only studies remains limited relative to the broad literature on the species and stem. Future work should repeat macro- and microscopic measurements across authenticated populations and report the number of plants, leaves, fields of view and measurement replicates. Data should be presented with means, dispersion and sampling details. The aim should be to establish realistic ranges rather than a single number that may not represent biological variation.

11.2 Seasonal, geographic and developmental variation

Seasonal sampling was incorporated in the comparative study by Choudhary et al. [1], highlighting the relevance of collection timing. Future studies should examine whether leaf age, season, geography, cultivation practice and post-harvest handling influence microscopic parameters, extractive values and marker profiles. A multi-location design would help distinguish stable diagnostic characters from environmentally sensitive traits. Chemical fingerprints can be linked to voucher records and environmental metadata to support reproducible sourcing.

11.3 Stronger compound identification

Many phytochemical screening studies rely on qualitative tests that are useful for initial exploration but provide limited structural specificity. Future studies should pair screening with HPTLC/HPLC and mass-spectrometric confirmation. Researchers should clearly label compounds as confirmed, tentatively annotated or inferred from prior literature. Where marker standards are available, quantitative methods should be validated. Where standards are unavailable, semi-quantitative or untargeted metabolomic approaches should be described with appropriate limitations.

11.4 Better reporting of extraction and assay conditions

Comparisons among studies are difficult when the solvent, leaf-to-solvent ratio, extraction time, temperature, sonication conditions and dry-matter basis are not fully reported. A minimum reporting checklist would improve reproducibility. Bioassay reports should identify positive and negative controls, concentrations, replication, statistical methods and the basis of activity calculations. Extraction optimization should be linked to clearly stated endpoints and should include confirmation runs. A high extract yield is not automatically equivalent to a high concentration of a desired marker.



11.5 Link chemistry to biological relevance

Leaf-specific biological activity should be interpreted alongside chemical characterization of the same batch. If a leaf extract shows activity, the study should report its fingerprint, marker content and extraction yield so that another laboratory can attempt replication. Fractionation and bioassay-guided work may help identify active constituents, but isolated compounds should be tested at concentrations relevant to the original extract. Mechanistic claims should be supported by appropriate controls and, where possible, orthogonal methods. Ultimately, any clinical application requires standardized preparations and well-designed human studies.

11.6 Sustainability and supply-chain quality

Leaves may offer an alternative source of plant material without requiring the same harvesting practices as stem collection, but sustainability should be assessed rather than assumed. Harvest intensity can affect plant health, regrowth and future leaf production. Good agricultural and collection practices, traceability, correct species identification and appropriate drying facilities can improve quality at source. Supply-chain controls should discourage substitution with related species and should keep leaf material distinct from stems when the product specification requires leaves.

XII. LIMITATIONS OF THE AVAILABLE LITERATURE

The literature has several limitations. First, studies use different plant parts and sometimes describe material only as aerial parts or Giloy extract, making organ-specific interpretation difficult. Second, extraction solvents and analytical methods vary, so qualitative and quantitative results may not be directly comparable. Third, some reviews repeat species-level compound lists without consistently specifying the original plant part or level of identification. Fourth, leaf microscopy values from one study are not automatically generalizable across populations, seasons or laboratories. Fifth, there are limited data supporting universally applicable acceptance ranges for all leaf-specific physicochemical parameters. Finally, antioxidant, antimicrobial and immunomodulatory results from laboratory models should not be equated with demonstrated clinical benefit.

These limitations do not mean that the leaves lack value; they indicate that the evidence must be interpreted carefully. A focused review can identify reproducible observations, show where direct evidence exists, and propose methods to close the gaps. The most important next step is not simply to add more broad claims about the species, but to generate well-documented, voucher-linked leaf data with validated analytical methods.

XIII. CONCLUSION

Tinospora cordifolia leaves are a distinct botanical material that warrants dedicated pharmacognostical and phytochemical evaluation. Published comparative work describes recognizable leaf features, including a cordate lamina, reticulate venation, dorsiventral mesophyll, anomocytic stomata and unicellular trichomes. The same work reported differences in selected physicochemical and phytochemical measurements among leaves, stems and aerial roots, reinforcing the need to identify the exact plant part used in each analysis [1]. Recent extraction and LC-MS/MS research has added opportunities for more detailed chemical profiling of leaf extracts, while reviews of leaf applications point to potential areas for further study [7,8].

At present, a careful leaf-quality programme should combine taxonomic authentication, voucher documentation, macroscopic and microscopic examination, physicochemical testing, chromatographic fingerprinting, validated marker analysis and appropriate contaminant testing. Qualitative phytochemical reactions are useful for screening but cannot replace compound-specific confirmation. Stem or whole-plant findings should not be used as evidence for leaves unless the original study directly supports that interpretation. More multi-season, multi-location and methodologically transparent studies are needed to establish robust leaf-specific reference ranges and to determine whether chemical differences are linked to reproducible biological effects. A cautious, evidence-based approach will support better authentication, quality control and responsible future development of Giloy leaf preparations.

Figure captions (proposed; original figures should be prepared from authenticated material)



Figure 1. Suggested workflow for pharmacognostical and phytochemical evaluation of authenticated *Tinospora cordifolia* leaves: collection and voucher authentication; macroscopic examination; leaf and powder microscopy; physicochemical evaluation; extraction; preliminary screening; chromatographic fingerprinting; marker confirmation; and quality interpretation.

Figure 2. Proposed evidence hierarchy for interpreting Giloy leaf research. Direct leaf-specific studies provide the primary basis for leaf claims; comparative studies are interpreted by plant part; stem-only and whole-plant studies provide context but do not independently establish leaf composition or efficacy.

Figure 3. Representative diagnostic features to document in an original leaf micrograph plate: upper and lower epidermis, stomata, trichomes, lamina transverse section, midrib transverse section, petiole section and powder microscopy. Images should be generated from authenticated study material and include scale bars; no unverified micrograph should be presented as original data.

REFERENCES

- [1] Choudhary N, Siddiqui MB, Khatoon S. Pharmacognostic evaluation of *Tinospora cordifolia* (Willd.) Miers and identification of biomarkers. *Indian J Tradit Knowl*. 2014;13(3):543-550.
- [2] World Health Organization. Quality control methods for herbal materials. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2011.
- [3] Kumar P, Kamle M, Mahato DK, Bora H, Sharma B, Rasane P, et al. *Tinospora cordifolia* (Giloy): phytochemistry, ethnopharmacology, clinical application and conservation strategies. *Curr Pharm Biotechnol*. 2020;21(12):1165-1175. doi:10.2174/1389201021666200430114547.
- [4] Singh D, Chaudhuri PK. Chemistry and pharmacology of *Tinospora cordifolia*. *Nat Prod Commun*. 2017;12(2):299-308.
- [5] Sharma P, Dwivedee BP, Bisht D, Dash AK, Kumar D. The chemical constituents and diverse pharmacological importance of *Tinospora cordifolia*. *Heliyon*. 2019;5(9):e02437. doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e02437.
- [6] Chaudhary A, Das R, Mehta K, Mehta DK. Indian herb *Tinospora cordifolia* and *Tinospora* species: phytochemical and therapeutic application. *Heliyon*. 2024;10(10):e31229. doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e31229.
- [7] Singh SM, Tripathy S, Srivastav PP. Bioactive compound extraction from giloy leaves and stem using ultrasound: bioactivity, antimicrobial, and LC-MS/MS study. *Food Sci Biotechnol*. 2025;34(9):1835-1847. doi:10.1007/s10068-024-01810-x.
- [8] Singh J, Saxena E, Chaudhary AR, Kaur M, Salotra M, Rasane P, et al. Immunomodulatory properties of Giloy (*Tinospora cordifolia*) leaves and its applications in value-added products. *Heliyon*. 2025;11(1):e40948. doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e40948.
- [9] Verma DK, Kimmy G, Kumar P, El-Shazly M. Unmasking the many faces of Giloy (*Tinospora cordifolia* L.): a fresh look on its phytochemical and medicinal properties. *Curr Pharm Des*. 2021;27(22):2571-2581. doi:10.2174/138161282666200625111530.
- [10] Modi B, Koirala N, Aryal SP, Shrestha J, Koirala S, Upadhyaya J, et al. *Tinospora cordifolia* (Willd.) Miers: phytochemical composition, cytotoxicity, proximate analysis and their biological activities. *Cell Mol Biol (Noisy-le-grand)*. 2021;67(1):50-57. doi:10.14715/cmb/2021.67.1.8.
- [11] Balkrishna A, Kumar A, Rohela A, Arya V, Gautam AK, Sharma H, et al. Traditional uses, hepatoprotective potential, and phytopharmacology of *Tinospora cordifolia*: a narrative review. *J Pharm Pharmacol*. 2024;76(3):183-200. doi:10.1093/jpp/rgae013.
- [12] Anonymous. The Ayurvedic Pharmacopoeia of India. Part I. New Delhi: Government of India, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Department of AYUSH; applicable monographs and general methods.
- [13] Evans WC. Trease and Evans Pharmacognosy. 16th ed. Edinburgh: Saunders Elsevier; 2009.
- [14] Harborne JB. Phytochemical Methods: A Guide to Modern Techniques of Plant Analysis. 3rd ed. London: Chapman & Hall; 1998.



- [15] European Medicines Agency. Guideline on quality of herbal medicinal products/traditional herbal medicinal products. London: European Medicines Agency; current applicable revision.
- [16] International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q2(R2): Validation of Analytical Procedures. Geneva: ICH; 2023.
- [17] International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q14: Analytical Procedure Development. Geneva: ICH; 2023.
- [18] World Health Organization. WHO guidelines on good agricultural and collection practices (GACP) for medicinal plants. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2003.
- [19] World Health Organization. WHO guidelines for assessing quality of herbal medicines with reference to contaminants and residues. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2007.

