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

Dino Davosir

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article appears to be well-written; however, for a review article, it is too short and would benefit from additional content and references to increase the article's impact in the future. The article would also benefit from a table with all references regarding *Rubus fraxinifolius* in one place, and also, at least another figure.

Please provide a short methodological section as part of the introduction where you describe the method of data gathering (which databases were used).

The natural composition section only focused on a rather small array of compounds, while some compound classes were ignored. This must definitely be improved, and each class of chemical compounds should have its own section. For example, reports on the protein content are important from a nutritional perspective. Also, providing context on recommended daily values for sugars, vitamin C, and iron would help readers grasp the practical implications of *R. fraxinifolius* nutritional content. Flavonoids are mentioned in the text, but no individual flavonoids were mentioned later. Different extraction methods should be argued for, to evaluate the potential differences in results of various *R. fraxinifolius* studies.

If there is no data on *R. fraxinifolius* on a wider array of individual compounds, maybe the author should have focused on a chemical characterization study rather than a review article. An alternative suggestion in case the study on chemical characterization is currently unattainable is to further expand on the comparison of *R. fraxinifolius* nutrient content with other members of the Rosaceae family, not only the genus Rubus (examples of such studies are included and could be referenced [1], [2], etc.).

Furthermore, the article would benefit from the inclusion of some *in vivo* results regarding the bioactivity, if there are any. As an alternative, some regard of that should be added if there are no such results available at the moment, to differentiate the results of in vitro assays from their actual potential *in vivo*.

Regarding the cultivation efforts, the author should provide insights on how to improve these efforts for higher bioactivity, like biofortification techniques, etc. In the conclusion, the author should recommend actual future research focuses regarding *R. fraxinifolius*, e.g., propose detailed metabolomic profiling analyses, *in vivo* bioactivity analyses, etc.

Minor errors: In the Figure 1., calorie content should be accompanied by a measuring unit.

Altogether, the article provides interesting information on *R. fraxinifolius* biopotential, but should be more focused, with additional data included (especially a clear and focused presentation of individual compounds), along with references and especially comparisons with other Rosaceae, due to the lack of data on *R. fraxinifolius.*

References

1. ^*K. Kara, B. Güçlü, E. Baytok. (2015).Comparison of nutrient composition and anti-methanogenic properties of different <i>Rosaceae</i> species. J. Anim. Feed Sci., vol. 24 (4), 308-314. doi:10.22358/jafs/65613/2015.*
2. ^*Ivana Šola, Danijela Poljuha, Maja Mikulic-Petkovsek, Dino Davosir, et al. (2022).Biopotential of Underutilized Rosaceae Inflorescences: LC-DAD-MS Phytochemical Profiles Associated with Antioxidant, Antidiabetic, Anti-Inflammatory and Antiproliferative Activity In Vitro. Plants, vol. 11 (3), 271. doi:10.3390/plants11030271.*