

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>

Review Form 3

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 manuscript is a systematic review and meta-analysis on the efficacy of <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> in managing high blood pressure. This study is timely, as hypertension is a significant global health issue, particularly in low- and middle-income countries. By analyzing randomized controlled trials and observational studies, the authors highlight <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> as a potential natural therapy for hypertension. Their findings have important implications for integrating herbal treatments into hypertension care in resource-limited settings. Additionally, the authors identify gaps in the current literature and suggest future research directions, enhancing the manuscript's relevance to the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	If preferred, the title could be slightly rephrased for brevity: "Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> in Hypertension Management".	
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 authors should clarify the numerical outcomes of the meta-analysis, including the specific reductions in systolic and diastolic blood pressure, to improve the abstract's clarity. The conclusion should also highlight the practical implications for clinical guidelines or resource-limited settings.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The results align with the study objectives, and the discussion effectively contextualizes the findings. The manuscript notes limitations, including study heterogeneity and the need for standardized formulations and dosages of <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> . Minor Comment: A figure or table summarizing the meta-analysis results (effect sizes and heterogeneity) would enhance clarity for readers.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	For further robustness, consider including recent studies exploring the molecular mechanisms of <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> 's antihypertensive effects (e.g., nitric oxide pathways or renin-angiotensin system interactions).	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language is clear, scholarly, and suitable for academic publication. The writing is concise, well-organized, and free from major grammatical errors. However, it is AI-generated, which means it may not be directly usable for publication.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript offers a significant contribution to the field of hypertension management, especially regarding natural and complementary therapies. Future research directions are clearly identified, providing a roadmap for upcoming clinical trials on <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> . Additionally, including a graphical abstract or flowchart that summarizes the systematic review process, such as a PRISMA diagram, could improve accessibility for readers. The manuscript raises no ethical issues as it is a systematic review and meta-analysis of previously published studies. No new human or animal participants were involved, so ethical approval is not needed. The authors also followed PRISMA guidelines for their work. _PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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:	Yogesh Ramkisan Urdukhe
Department, University & Country	Jalna Education Society's R.G. Bagdia Arts, S.B. Lakhotia Commerce and R. Bezonji Science College, India