

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: JNHM- 154

Title: Homoeopathic Interventions for Cutaneous Warts: A Systematic Review and Evidence Synthesis Across Clinical Types.

Recommendation:

Accept after minor revision

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			✓	
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Reviewer's ID: JPR-Bilqees Hamza

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Overview

This manuscript provides a systematic review and evidence synthesis evaluating homoeopathic interventions for cutaneous warts across various clinical types. Conducted in alignment with PRISMA 2020 and PRISMA-S guidelines, the authors searched major biomedical and traditional medicine databases (including PubMed/MEDLINE, Google Scholar, Crossref, DOAJ, AYUSH, and CCRH) for literature published between January 2000 and July 2026.

From an initial screening pool, 12 publications representing 10 unique studies met the inclusion criteria. The included literature comprises one randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled pilot study ($n=60$) and nine uncontrolled observational studies or clinical case series. While observational reports frequently noted high rates of clinical clearance—including a 70% favorable response rate in a 100-patient cohort—they lacked control groups, relied on non-standardized outcome definitions, and failed to systematically track adverse events or long-term recurrence. Conversely, the sole placebo-controlled trial found no statistically significant difference between individualized homoeopathy and placebo regarding wart number ($p=.741$), wart size ($p=.515$), or quality-of-life metrics ($p=.935$). Quantitative meta-analyses could not be conducted due to outcome reporting heterogeneity. The authors conclude that current evidence does not support the efficacy of homoeopathy over placebo or conventional therapies, with overall evidence certainty rated as very low.

Detailed Suggestions for Improvement

REVIEWER'S REPORT

1. Formatting, Layout, and Typographical Refinements

- **Table and Figure Formatting Artifacts:** Several section headers and table elements contain merged or distorted text blocks. For example, lines 146–148 in the text flow directly into table elements, and lines 233–234 show duplicated table column headers. Reformat Table 2 to ensure distinct cell boundaries and clear spacing between headers and narrative text.
- **Line-by-Line Typos and Grammatical Edits:**
 - Line 31: Ensure space consistency in the keywords list.
 - Lines 86–87: Fix typographical encoding errors in the text (e.g., "8687 randomized" and "non87 randomized").
 - Line 169: Ensure consistent spacing around statistical reporting variables (e.g., $p = .741$, $p = .515$, and $p = .935$).
 - Line 203: Complete the truncated sentence ending at "level of" at the end of the paragraph.
 - Line 219: Correct the formatting in "Dermal Quality of Life scale" to match the earlier standard abbreviation "Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI)".

2. Methodological Clarifications and Synthesis Consistency

- **Methodological Justification for Single vs. Dual Reviewers:** The manuscript outlines study selection and data extraction in Section 2 (lines 106–114) but does not explicitly state whether screening and extraction were conducted independently by two reviewers. Clarify reviewer counts and inter-rater agreement protocols to ensure full PRISMA compliance.
- **Overlapping Cohort Accounting:** The text correctly identifies that Lathia & Patel (2024), Lathia & Patel (2025), and Lathiya et al. (2025) originate from the same parent cohort of 100 patients. Ensure that summary counts in narrative sections strictly avoid double-counting these participants when summarizing total pooled case numbers across the review.
- **Handling of High-Risk / Uncontrolled Studies:** Address the limitations of compiling uncontrolled case series alongside trial data. Expanding on the methodological distinction between clinical observation and causal inference in Section 4 will strengthen the critique of uncontrolled studies.

3. Clinical Context and Discussion Enhancement

- **Risk Guidance and Red Flags:** Section 4 highlights critical red flags requiring conventional medical evaluation or biopsy (e.g., persistent, bleeding, rapidly growing, or anogenital warts). Consider organizing these key clinical safety red flags into a distinct text box or bulleted list for quick reference by clinicians.

Jana Nexus: Journal of Health and Medicine

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

<https://www.jananexushm.com>

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- **Gaps in Specific Subgroups:** Emphasize the complete absence of eligible studies on anogenital warts. Elaborate slightly on the public health implications of diagnostic and management delays in HPV-associated anogenital lesions.

4. Reference List and Citation Standardizations

- Ensure uniform reference formatting across all bibliography entries (lines 375–457). Verify that all journal titles are consistently spelled or abbreviated, check that DOIs are formatted as full HTTPS URLs, and ensure complete volume, issue, and page numbers are supplied for all journal references.

Recommendation for the Editor

- **Decision:** Accept with Minor Revision
- **Justification:** The manuscript addresses a relevant topic in complementary medicine and dermatology by providing a rigorous synthesis of the evidence for homoeopathic treatment of cutaneous warts. The review methodology adheres to PRISMA standards, and the conclusions are appropriately grounded in the data, emphasizing that observational reports cannot establish efficacy in the absence of robust randomized controlled trials. The required revisions are minor and primarily concern structural text cleanup, correction of typographical errors, standardization of tables, and minor clarifications regarding review processes.