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Reviewer's report:

The paper is interesting but some main concerns are as followings.

1. It is unclear what is the main finding of this review and where is the review discussion.

2. The authors should have discussion. The section should be started with review finding interpretation, follow by agreement with others, strength and weakness of the findings, applicability and implication in clinical practice and future research.

3. Sequence of the results is difficult to follow. No any treatment effect magnitude and its precision are presented. It should be presented as

3.1) search results with some explanation of excluded papers at each screening step before having the 11 final included studies.

3.2 description of included trial characteristics and their risk of bias result

3.3 then effects of R. rosea for each comparison should be presented in summary statistics as mentioned in the analysis plan if possible.

4. In background

The information of Active Constituents does not provide any benefit to the paper rationale.

Minor points in Methods

1. Authors report "Study design: any experimental clinical study" in the inclusion criteria. But they report " .....to identify clinical studies, experimental or observational,......" in abstract. They are not consistency.

2. A typo in the analysis plan, ....potssssible

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests