

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

Anna Gavrilova<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Medical University Pleven

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The endemic status of the species *Rubus fraxinifolius* Poir. brings special attention to the topic of the presented review. In the light of contemporary concepts of sustainable utilization of medicinal plant resources and nature conservation, the enhancement of our knowledge of the medicinal properties and cultivation prospectives of endemic species is of great importance. However, I have some remarks and recommendations for the author for increasing the quality of the work:

1. In the title and at the first mention of *Rubus fraxinifolius* in the body text, the author's abbreviation of the taxonomical name of the species should be mentioned - *Rubus fraxinifolius* Poir.
2. The last part of the Abstract summarizes the previous part and duplicates the information in a briefer way. There is no need for any summarization at the end of this section.
3. In the Introduction: "Local variations of roгимот come in two forms:...". What is the taxonomic name of the second "form," regarding the fruit shape?
4. I advise using the short spelling "*R. fraxinifolius*" after the first mention of the species in the body text instead of using various traditional names like "ragimot," "rogimot," or "arben." If you still insist on using these names, pick up one of them and spell it with a lowercase first letter.
5. One of the mentions of the ragimot berry in the Introduction is followed by "(*Rubus* spp.)" – the author should be correct if the name "ragimot" includes more than one species of *Rubus* and should not mislead the readers.
6. All pharmacological properties of the plant which are mentioned in the middle of the Introduction should be followed by a citation.
7. The fruits of *R. fraxinifolius* are not drupes with measures 2.5X1.5 cm. They are berries of aggregated drupes.
8. Throughout the whole Introduction, the information regarding *R. fraxinifolius* is mixed with information on the genus *Rubus* in a chaotic manner. I suggest revising the text so as to acquire the following structure: 1) Significance of genus *Rubus* – diversity, medicinal use, and pharmacological properties; 2) *R. fraxinifolius* – common names, distribution, habitat, conservation status, threats, brief description, vegetation period, significance as a wild animal food base (is it significant for some threatened animal species?).
9. The sections "Nutritional composition" and "Functional properties" include similar data about the species given with different words. The two sections should be renamed adequately and revised. When giving some property or effect of the plant parts of *R. fraxinifolius*, the study method should be described in brief. This information is not given for any

citation in the text.

10. Some conclusions do not follow the previous analysis of the referenced sources. Apart from vitamin C, there is no other information on the vitamin content of the species; the same is true for minerals. The fibre content is just mentioned in Fig. 1 without any reference and explanation in the text. There is no data supporting the properties of ragimot benefitting cardiovascular health, the immune system, blood sugar levels, or anti-inflammatory properties.
11. The figures are not supported by the text and are not mentioned anywhere in the text.