

Review of: "Exploring the Significance and Medicinal Potential of *Rubus fraxinifolius*: A Review of Ragimot Wildberry"

Cláudio Daniel Cerdeira

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Qeios Team/Author,

I have completed the first round of review of the manuscript entitled "Exploring the Significance and Medicinal Potential of *Rubus fraxinifolius*: A Review of Ragimot Wildberry," by Rawi M.H. This is an interesting topic for a manuscript, and I think it is potentially publishable after "major revisions." I hope to contribute some helpful comments.

Please find helpful feedback on the manuscript below.

Sincerely,

Dr. Cláudio Daniel Cerdeira,

Independent Researcher, Brazil

Comments to the author

Dear author,

This is a valuable topic to explore in a manuscript, but there are some improvements (below) and issues that need to be addressed. Here are some suggestions with helpful feedback on the manuscript.

Major concerns:

- The article is too short to be a review article. The author should add a more in-depth state of the art on the medicinal properties of this plant, highlighting everything from its biological value (also mention toxicity, concentrations for bioactivities and selective index) to its ethnopharmacology (popular use, forms) and real clinical impact (cite RCTs wherever possible).
- Image 3 source is missing.

Minor concerns:

:

- The title is redundant.

- Summary: "high levels of sugar". The author should better distinguish this class of macromolecule (carbohydrate) and its biological implications (e.g., whether high glucose levels and/or fructose and/or others).
- Figures should be cited in the text.

Other considerations: ethical aspects

- Did the author write the article using any kind of AI tool? A statement of "use" (such as "use in part" to help writing) or "not use," if so, should be mentioned. In a process that is still evolving with respect to the practice of using any AI tool, the author(s) need to report the potential use of any AI tools and clarify this with the editors and reviewers (in the case of Qeios, the reviewer also participates as an editor). This is necessary in order to establish a boundary for detecting possible inappropriate use (until now, whether or not it is possible to use AI tools to support the writing process has been confusing in the literature; just like related to plagiarism), and to establish an ethical framework for the subject, as it is a new issue in terms of its incorporation into academic-scientific practice.

Overall reviewer's contribution:

I think that the article has the potential to be published. My contribution is to present suggestions and considerations to improve the manuscript for publication on Qeios and to recheck it if necessary (major revisions).

Decision: major revisions

Sincerely,

Dr. Cláudio Daniel Cerdeira,

Independent Researcher, Brazil