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|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This review offered alternative or adjuvant therapy for cervical cancer, considering that cervical cancer is one of the deadliest cancers in the world. Herbal medicine utilizes natural compounds as a modality for preventing or treating cervical cancer with minimal side effects. This study provides a new perspective for further research to explore herbal compounds for treating cervical cancer, both as alternative and adjuvant therapies, with minimal side effects. | Thank you for the positive comment. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Yes, the title is suitable. | Thank you for the positive comment. |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. However, some points can be considered:   1. It is recommended to add literature search methods, including what databases were used, what year range, and what main keywords were used. 2. Some structural corrections include: 1) “the aims of this review is…” should be “the aims of this review are…” or “this review aims to…”; 2) “a extensive review…” should be “an extensive review…”. | Thank you for the suggestions; the literature search details have been added, and all structural and grammatical corrections have been addressed. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. However, some suggestions need to be noted and considered further:   1. Background  * The background is too long and rambling, it would be better if it was shortened and focused on cancer/cervical cancer and the use of natural active compounds. * The third paragraph of the background needs to be reconsidered whether it needs to be included or not, considering that the definition and history related to medicinal plants are too long. * Authors have not critically explained why this herbal treatment investigation is necessary. Are there any gaps or shortcomings in current cervical cancer treatments that warrant this review? A clear rationale for this is strongly recommended.  1. Methods  * Authors did not provide an explanation regarding how the articles were reviewed in this manuscript. * It would be better if authors provided a brief explanation regarding the review method used, what databases were used to search for the sources/studies reviewed, what inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied, the range of publication years selected to see the relevance of the study to the study results, and the keywords used during the literature search.  1. Review  * In the abstract (methods), authors stated that the review was conducted to evaluate the effects of natural compounds on cervical cancer, specifically HeLa and SiHa cell lines. However, in the sub-section on the compound carvacrol, authors declared that no studies on human cervical cancer, HeLa, or SiHa have been conducted. The review of carvacrol needs to be justified, why was this compound included in the review when no studies on cervical cancer have been conducted? * Overall, the review was comprehensive. However, authors are recommended adding a discussion on the potential synergy between, for example, herbal compounds and conventional cancer treatments, as the title mentions synergy but does not explicitly discuss it. | Thank you for the detailed and constructive suggestions; we have shortened and refocused the background, added the rationale and literature search methodology, justified the inclusion of carvacrol, and incorporated discussion on potential synergy as recommended. |
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| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes, the language quality is suitable for scholarly communications. | **Thank you for the positive comment.** |
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