

Peer Review

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

Danton de Souza¹

1. Universidade Federal de São Paulo, Brazil

Dear Editors and Authors,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript entitled: "*Efficacy of Aromatherapy on Children: A Systematic Review with Meta-Analysis*." I congratulate the authors on this excellent study, which demonstrates methodological rigor and contributes meaningfully to pediatric nursing. Only a few points raised concerns for me, which I detail below. I recommend a **minor revision** of the manuscript and remain available to review the revised version.

ABSTRACT

The abstract is appropriate, presenting the main findings of the included studies along with a recognition of the low quality of the evidence.

BACKGROUND

I suggest that the definition of aromatherapy be provided immediately after the practice is introduced in the background section, as there is a noticeable gap between the contextualization and its definition.

METHODS

Did the authors register the protocol for this systematic review?

Why did the authors restrict their search to only English and Italian? This is a significant limitation of the study, as there are many relevant studies on aromatherapy in the Brazilian context, where integrative and complementary practices have become public policy, as well as Spanish-language articles. A justification for this choice should be included.

Is Table 1 with the literature search accurate? For instance, in PubMed, analogous terms and filters should

have been included. It is important to present the complete search strategy—not just the descriptors—so that other researchers can replicate and update this study in the future.

RESULTS

The table listing all included studies could be placed as supplementary material, as Table 6 is more relevant and makes a significant contribution to the manuscript.

In Figure 1, the authors state that non-clinical studies were excluded. However, these studies were not excluded per se, as they were never part of the study sample. Exclusion criteria are not simply the inverse of inclusion criteria. The same reasoning applies to all data labeled as excluded.

The descriptive data in the section "Main characteristics of the included studies" could be better presented in graphs, allowing for more accessible visualization and reducing reader fatigue.

DISCUSSION

The authors provide an excellent discussion. They acknowledge the study's limitations and highlight its strengths, paving the way for future research and contributing to the advancement of knowledge in this field.

Best regards,

Professor Danton Matheus de Souza

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.