



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Pharmacology*

**Manuscript NO:** 78795

**Title:** Controversial Usages of Kratom (*Mitragyna speciosa*): for Good or for Evil

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06211870

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MMed

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Malaysia

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-07-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-08-19 06:13

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-08-19 06:44

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

#### **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.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Pharmacology*

**Manuscript NO:** 78795

**Title:** Controversial Usages of Kratom (*Mitragyna speciosa*): for Good or for Evil

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04232981

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Bangladesh

**Author's Country/Territory:** Malaysia

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-07-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-09-03 02:59

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-09-12 02:00

**Review time:** 8 Days and 23 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous



statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ **Y** ] No

### **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? 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. 2. The pharmacokinetics of kratom: section is modest. 3. Kratom Pharmacology: not properly written. 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. 5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. 6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos 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.