

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

Rosaria Costa¹

¹ University of Messina

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Even though defined as “mini”, a review should collect an extensive number of papers dealing with its claimed topic. The present article cites only six publications, though. The *Viburnum* genus includes more than one hundred species, therefore being overinvestigated in the literature. Indeed, the title promises to focus on the correlation between *Viburnum* spp. and allergenicity as a novel issue of interest. But the evidence of such effect is really scarce, as can be seen in Table 1. When writing a review, it is fundamental to define CLEARLY: i) the searching criteria, such as timeframe, keywords, and other filters; ii) the scientific sources of the bibliography (highly reputed databases and/or platforms). In general, the organization of the article appears fragile, the text is poor, and not relevant information is given to keep one eager to read. For instance, in the introduction, the morphological description should anticipate the bioactive properties. Also, since the title mentions the allergenicity, this should be discussed. The presentation of “methods” is confusing. The results are only excerpts from a handbook of Botany.

There are numerous typos as well as format errors:

Abstract, dot missing at the end. “arranged” twice reported (lines 3 and 4, page 2). “for a complete gender review”: it is not clear. “plant&human” (consider revising to “plant & human”).

R&D section, line 1: “contain”. Line 7, “drupe that, on the plant...”. Page 3/5, line 3, “*V. lantana*” (should be also italicized); line 5, “North America north of Mexico”; line 6, Nanny-Berry should be in small letters; line 8, “Eurasiat-temperata”; line 9, AND should be in small letters; lines 10-11, remove underlined text; line 12, remove bold character; line 13, it is “ailments”; line 14, “stomach” is not an ailment; line 14, after (Rop O, 2010), put a dot; line 16, “epithetplicatum”; line 17, “the most popular”; lines 32-33, is “tannis” “tannins”? Line 33, “properties” instead of proprieties. Table 1, “*Viburnum lantana*”. “Lauristinus” should have an initial capital letter.

References must be formatted uniformly! Ref. 2 contains an error: medicine, not medecine.

Additionally, I suggest removing the feature “attracts butterflies” from each species because it is a factor common to the genus. The same is valid for the column “Flowering period.”

In conclusion, I believe that the bibliographic material on *Viburnum* spp. and allergenic potential is insufficient to support the writing of a review article.

