

Review of: "Kalya Research: Complementary and Alternative Medicine (CAM) Virtual Research Assistant from Biomedical Literature"

Xingsi Xue¹

¹ Fujian University of Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Upon evaluation of your manuscript "Kalya Research: Complementary and Alternative Medicine (CAM) Virtual Research Assistant from Biomedical Literature," I recommend a major revision to address several critical aspects that could significantly enhance the paper's contribution to the field.

The presented virtual research assistant, Kalya Research (KR), is an innovative tool designed to sift through the burgeoning volume of CAM-related publications. Your approach, which utilizes rule models and ontologies to recommend pertinent literature, holds promise for aiding medical researchers in this domain. However, several areas in the manuscript require significant improvements.

1. The manuscript would benefit from a clearer articulation of KR's unique contributions compared to existing tools. Highlighting specific features that set KR apart from established databases and research assistants would better position your tool within the current landscape.
2. The current description of KR's architecture and functionality needs to be more detailed. A comprehensive presentation of the rule models, ontologies, and the underlying AI mechanisms would provide readers with a deeper understanding of the tool's capabilities.
3. While you compare KR to Medline in a case study, the experimental methodology and results require further elaboration. Detailed metrics and a broader range of test cases would substantiate KR's effectiveness and efficiency.
4. User experience plays a critical role in the adoption of digital tools. A usability study, with feedback from real-world users, could provide valuable insights into KR's practicality and user-friendliness.
5. The discussion on future improvements is promising, but it would be beneficial to prioritize these enhancements based on potential impact. Clarify which features are likely to be most valuable to your target audience and outline a roadmap for KR's development.
6. The proposal to develop a new indicator for assessing the scientific relevance of publications is intriguing. More information on this aspect would be of high interest to readers, particularly on how it would work and its potential advantages.

7. There is also a need to compare KR with other non-SCI indexed tools, as many CAM resources may not be indexed in traditional scientific databases.

8. Expand on the current state of CAM research assistants and databases to better frame the necessity for a tool like KR. The manuscript should provide a more extensive review of related work to contextually situate KR.

In summary, the manuscript stands to benefit greatly from a revision that sharpens the focus on KR's innovation, provides a more robust technical and experimental exposition, and offers a clearer vision of its future development. These enhancements will greatly increase the manuscript's potential impact and publication readiness.