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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.
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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.
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.