

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. 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.	The manuscript contributes to the ongoing investigation into alternative therapies and treatments for managing climacteric symptoms. It is significant as it highlights the gaps in evidence and standardization issues in current research. This systematic review could help refine future study designs and guide clinical decision making in using herbal therapies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title talks about comparison between CR and MN with SI. But the paper throughout has used the word herbal remedies in general. Suggested title: <i>Effectiveness and Safety of Herbal Therapies Compared to Soy Isoflavones for Climacteric Symptoms: A Systematic Review of Reviews</i> It's just a suggestion.	
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.	The abstract thought provides a concise summary but could benefit from clarifying the in few lines the research gap. For instance, mention specific gaps in methodological consistency and the implications for clinical use. An abstract should have a gist of everything that the research encompasses.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The methodology, including database selection and use of AMSTAR-2 tool, is robust. However, the review would benefit from a more detailed synthesis of excluded studies. Maybe the inclusion-exclusion criteria could be more refined. The tool used and the data bases included are robust. There is no point of doing the review if no study is included in it. Either the inclusion -exclusion criteria has to be modified or solid reasoning has to be given for the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally comprehensive and recent. Adding more meta-analysis on CR could enhance context. For instance, only one study is cited in the review for CR	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are some typo errors, and some sentences are repeated as well. A little proof reading can help and refine. 2. Also, throughout the paper this has not been mentioned as to why the comparison between the effects of these particular herbs with SI was considered. The rationale or motivation or that connection was missing. Rest the introduction the linking paragraphs are well written. 	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Spriha Sharma
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Technology, India