

Answer to reviewers' comments:

First of all, we would like to thank you for the comments, we have tried our best to rearrange the content of the manuscript.

Best regards,

Prof Gam.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Title: Controversial Usages of Kratom (*Mitragyna speciosa*): for Good or for Evil Journal: World Journal of Pharmacology The topic is of interest, and the manuscript is well illustrated. Major Comments: 1. Are there controversies in this field?

Answer: Yes, the use of kratom is always a controversies issues. Currently Thailand has legalized the use of kratom, although it stated for therapeutic use, but monitoring is not possible as kratom is grown well in the country.

What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript.

Answer: We have quoted 45 out of 115 references that were published in the last five years. So throughout the review, there are mostly quite recent findings on kratom.

2. The pharmacokinetics of kratom: section is modest.

Answer: We have rearranged it .

3. Kratom Pharmacology: not properly written.

Answer: We have rearranged it and divided it into subheadings.

4. Conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.

Answer: we have rewritten the conclusion.

5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning.

Answer: We have reorganized it.

6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript.

Answer: Corrections have been done throughout the manuscript.

7. English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.

Answer: **the English was edited.**

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: This review article provides a comprehensive account of the advantages and disadvantages of kratom. It is recommended that the review refine the subheadings in the text to make the idea of the article clearer and more explicit.

Answer: We have divided it into subheadings.