

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_128768
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of Hibiscus sabdariffa in Managing High Blood Pressure: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	The study provides a thorough and systematic review of the evidence regarding Hibiscus sabdariffa and its antihypertensive effects. By including multiple databases (PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, etc.) and adhering to PRISMA guidelines, the authors ensure the robustness of their search strategy.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes the title is suitable	
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 and by reading this abstract the whole idea of this review article is cleared	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes it is scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes the references are sufficient	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the language is suitable	
Optional/General comments	<p>This review effectively highlights the potential antihypertensive benefits of Hibiscus sabdariffa, supported by systematic evidence synthesis. The clear objectives, frameworks, and methodological rigor strengthen the study's quality. However, refining the search terms discussing generalizability concerns and providing more specific recommendations for future research would improve its impact.</p> <p>Strengths of the Literature:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive Coverage: The study provides a thorough and systematic review of the evidence regarding Hibiscus sabdariffa and its antihypertensive effects. By including multiple databases (PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, etc.) and adhering to PRISMA guidelines, the authors ensure the robustness of their search strategy. Clear Objectives: The study objectives are well-defined (RO1, RO2, RO3), and the need for this review is effectively justified based on the global burden of hypertension and growing interest in natural treatments. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>3. Methodological Rigor: The use of appropriate tools such as the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool and the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale to assess study quality strengthens the credibility of the findings.</p> <p>4. Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks: The frameworks clearly demonstrate the pathways through which Hibiscus sabdariffa exerts its effects, offering readers a deeper understanding of the mechanisms involved.</p> <p>5. Practical Implications: The study emphasizes Hibiscus sabdariffa as a non-pharmacological, accessible and natural intervention which is particularly relevant for low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) where healthcare access can be limited.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Clarification on Search Terms: While the search strategy is mentioned, some search terms like "hydration" may appear unrelated to Hibiscus sabdariffa. It would be helpful to clarify the relevance of all search terms used.<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Suggestion: Provide a rationale or supplementary table showing how each term relates to the study's objectives.2. Population Specificity: The abstract highlights the potential for Hibiscus sabdariffa in "diverse populations," but the introduction focuses heavily on Ghana.<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Suggestion: Ensure consistency in the scope. Either emphasize Ghana throughout or generalize the introduction to align with global hypertension trends.3. Mechanisms of Action: While the bioactive compounds are well-described, references to nitric oxide pathways and ACE inhibition could benefit from a brief explanation or additional evidence.<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Suggestion: Expand on the mechanisms or include visual illustrations to support these explanations.4. Exclusion Criteria: The criteria exclude studies with comorbidities unrelated to hypertension, but it is unclear how this might impact generalizability, especially for older populations who often have multiple conditions.<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Suggestion: Discuss the limitations of excluding such populations and potential impacts on the study's applicability.5. Future Directions: While the need for large-scale trials is mentioned, more specific recommendations (e.g., duration, dosage standardization, or diverse geographic focus) would add depth.<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Suggestion: Provide examples of study designs, methodologies, or populations that future research should prioritize.6. Language and Structure: The writing is clear and organized, but there is some repetition between the abstract and introduction regarding future research needs. Streamlining these sections can enhance conciseness.7. Figures and Tables: Consider including a PRISMA flowchart summarizing the study selection process and tables showing study characteristics or heterogeneity in the results.8. Practical Recommendations: The study could further elaborate on how Hibiscus sabdariffa can be integrated into existing hypertension management guidelines or traditional medicine practices. <p>Strengthening Areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Heterogeneity and Study Quality: "While heterogeneity between studies is briefly mentioned, a more detailed exploration of this factor including study quality and potential sources of bias would strengthen the review's reliability."2. Quantification of Results in the Discussion: "Although the meta-analysis reported significant reductions in blood pressure (e.g., 8.5 mmHg systolic) these specific values could be integrated into the discussion for clearer emphasis on the clinical significance."3. Long-Term Effects and Safety: "The review could benefit from a deeper discussion on the importance of long-term follow-up studies to address sustained efficacy and safety concerns particularly in populations with comorbidities."4. Standardization of Dosage and Formulations: "The authors highlight dosage variability as a limitation but could propose specific standardized protocols or recommendations for future studies to reduce inconsistencies."5. Interaction with Existing Medications: "The discussion mentions potential drug interactions but does not elaborate on specific examples or mechanisms. Including this detail would provide a more comprehensive view of H. sabdariffa safety profile." <p>References: By integrating these comments, you can highlight the strengths, contextual relevance, and coverage of the references while identifying gaps or patterns where necessary. The references are up-to-date.</p> <p>Summary: This review effectively highlights the potential antihypertensive benefits of Hibiscus sabdariffa, supported by systematic evidence synthesis. The clear objectives, frameworks, and methodological rigor strengthen the study's quality. However, refining the search terms discussing generalizability concerns and providing more specific recommendations for future research would improve its impact. No, there are no ethical issues in this manuscript</p>	
--	--	--

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:	Sidra Muhyuddin
Department, University & Country	Muhammad Nawaz Sharif University of Agriculture, Pakistan