

Peer Review

Review of: "Efficacy of Aromatherapy on Children: A Systematic Review with Meta-Analysis"

Daly Geagea^{1,2}

1. The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia; 2. Wired Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom

While I commend the authors for the well-written manuscript and well-conducted research, I have a few comments to enhance the quality of the manuscript.

1. The introduction is well-written, comprehensive, and clearly defines procedural pain, complementary therapy, and aromatherapy, in addition to explaining the gaps in research and the rationale for conducting a review. I recommend defining anxiety as well and explaining why anxiety, and not fear, was examined.
2. The methods section adheres to relevant guidelines and recommendations (PRISMA), which ensures good research practice.
3. A protocol was previously published to promote transparency in the publication process and research conduct.
4. The inclusion criteria cover all Population, Context, and Concept elements. I would still mention that the PCC mnemonic was used and explain how.
5. The results are comprehensive, but I would like to know if pain intensity or unpleasantness was reported and to see more figures (for countries, for example).
6. The summary of findings is well-written, but I would like to see the limitations and strengths of the review, as well as future directions.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.