Peer Review Report

Review Report on Marine natural products: Potential agents for depression treatment

Review, Acta Biochim. Pol.

EVALUATION

Q 1   Please summarize the main theme of the review.

Acceptable theme given in this article.

Q 2   Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Lack of in-depth discussion of each potential marine natural product.

Q 3   Does the review include a balanced, comprehensive and critical view of the research area?

not up to such a comprehensive article

Check List

Q 4   Is the English language of sufficient quality?

No.

Q 5   Is the quality of the figure(s) and/or table(s) satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 6   Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished or original data is not allowed for this article type)

Yes.

Q 7   Does the manuscript cover the topic in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

Q 8   Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

No.

Q 9 Does the manuscript include recent developments?

Yes.

Q 10 Does the review add new insights to the scholarly literature with respect to previously published reviews?

Yes.

Q 11 Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Check List)

kindly get the proper English language proofreader to identify the correct terminology that shall be used. Improve the intro part. The writing style and content in most of the texts need to be rewritten.

'Finding medicines with various targets that can concurrently combat multiple pathogenic causes is thus a crucial area of research for the creation of anti-depressant medications'. Such an example in this sentence needs a major revamp. This sentence needs to review the suitability of the 'pathogenic' term used. The style of writing is under par.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 12 Quality of generalization and summary

Q 13 Significance to the field

Q 14 Interest to a general audience

Q 15 Quality of writing