

Review of: "[Mini Review] Viburnum: an overview in relation to risks of allergy"

Barbara Sawicka¹

¹ University of Life Sciences

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Authors,

Review of the work entitled: MINI REVIEW "***Viburnum*: an overview in relation to risks of allergy**"

The article covers many key elements of a scientific study, including introduction, methodology, results, discussion, conclusions, and references to the literature. The title of the article, which refers to a review of the allergy risk associated with the genus *Viburnum*, is consistent with the content of the paper, which thoroughly discusses various species of this genus in terms of their potential impact on allergies. However, to further complement the article, a section on "Materials and Methods" could be added, providing detailed information on the research procedures used. Additionally, it would be useful to include an "Acknowledgments" and "Declaration of Conflicts of Interest" section if appropriate for the context of the study.

Strengths of work:

1. The review of the different species of the *Viburnum* genus for potential allergy risk is comprehensive and includes detailed information on each species studied.
2. The article included extensive scientific literature and references to research and publications, which strengthened the credibility of the information presented.
3. The vocabulary used in the text is specialized and adapted to the research topic, which contributes to the clarity and precision of the message.
4. Allergenicity data for individual *Viburnum* species are presented in tables, making it easier for the reader to quickly understand the results.
5. The conclusions of the review are clearly presented, and the analysis on plant allergenicity is comprehensive and well argued.

Weak sides of work:

1. The lack of a "Materials and Methods" section may prevent the reader from having a complete picture of the research methodology, which may limit understanding of the research process.
2. Some information in the text could be better organized to make it easier for the reader to navigate and understand the content, especially in the results section.

3. The lack of discussion of the potential practical implications of research findings for society or clinical practice may limit the usefulness of the article to public health practitioners and policymakers.
4. Some of the results could be better structured to facilitate comparison between *Viburnum* species in terms of their allergenicity.
5. The article could contain more references to current research and scientific reports in the field of plant allergology, which would strengthen the relevance and comprehensiveness of the analysis.