

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_127947
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness and safety of Cimicifuga racemosa and blackberry compared to soy isoflavone for the treatment of climacteric symptoms: A review of systematic reviews
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

**PART 1: Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This manuscript provides information on herbal medicine and scientific information on complementary and alternative medicine(CAM) for climacteric syndrome.</li> <li>2. They agree that the gold standard of published evidence is systematic reviews based on double-blind placebo control randomized clinical trials to recommend scientific evidence to prepare clinical guidelines.</li> <li>3. This manuscript teaches how to use the PICO framework to formulate the ideal research question and find the answer through research to support the evidence-based medicine (EBM) approach.</li> <li>4. In my opinion, this manuscript can be considered a publication of a modern well-woman unit of a teaching hospital that provides CAM to women who are not recommended to undergo hormone replacement therapy (HRT). The unit is located in a picturesque site with a lot of greenery in a quiet place, most probably in the subcontinent of India or the Southeast-Asian region.</li> </ol>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>Effectiveness and safety of Cimicifuga racemosa and blackberry compared to soy isoflavone for the treatment of climacteric symptoms: A review of systematic reviews may be able only in the next decade In my opinion above title is more suitable. I have provided the justification as a comment in the manuscript.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>The comments are made in the manuscript and addressed them to make a comprehensive.</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is scientific due to following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The research protocol was registered in PROSPERO under n. CDR 42024498124. The PRISMA 2020 guidelines were used to structure the article.</li> <li>2. Two independent reviewers assessed the eligibility of the studies. The reference manager ENDNOTE and the RAYYAN tool were used for study selection.</li> <li>3. Systematic reviews of randomized clinical trials, without language or publication year restrictions, were included if they addressed the effectiveness and safety of CR or MN compared to SI for use during the climacteric period was the inclusion criteria.</li> <li>4. <b>Two trained researchers, worked independently to avoid biases, extracted the data. Information such as author, year of publication, country, dosage, administration and presentation, comparator, methodological quality, and factors that prevented analysis (e.g., unavailable full texts or conference proceedings) were recorded in Excel (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA, USA</b></li> <li>5. They used the A MeaSurement Tool to Assess Systematic Reviews (AMSTAR-2) was to assess the methodological quality of the included studies and classify them into the following scores: critically low (more than one critical flaw), low (one critical flaw), moderate (more than one non-critical flaw), and high (no or one non-critical flaw).</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p><b>The references are sufficient and recent.</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>The quality of English of the article suitable for scholarly communication.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>This valuable paper requests all established research groups familiar with randomized clinical trials to come up with papers to assess the effectiveness and safety of blackberry and black cohosh to treat the climacteric syndrome of premenopausal, menopausal, and post-menopausal women openly.</b></p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</p>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Manosha Perera</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Menzies Institute of Health Queensland, Griffith University, Australia</b></p>