

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_94709
Title of the Manuscript:	People's Preferences for Traditional, Spiritual, Religious, and Folk Healers for Oncological Disorders
Type of the Article	Review Article

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajrn.com/index.php/AJRNH/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The article is well-written and deals with an important topic regarding people's preferences for traditional, spiritual, religious and folk healers for oncological disorders. It is based on comprehensive, systematic and empirical literature that was published between 1<sup>st</sup> January 2011 and 1<sup>st</sup> January 2021. Findings revealed that people engaged in different practices like using taweez or Holy water, blowing, wearing stones, pieces of cloth, engaging in spiritual practices, burning candles etc. Studies indicated that patients and their families preferred to avail such practices for a number of reasons including low socio-economic status, lack of availability of health resources, lack of screening systems and the like. As such, delay in cancer diagnosis and treatment is often the outcome. The abstract appears to reflect the body of the manuscript succinctly. The linguistic style is good and the author/s have taken the help of recent literature to supplant their findings. Major studies have been represented in a tabular fashion in the article. Discussion provided and conclusion drawn appear to be succinctly provided. APA style of referencing has been mostly followed in the article except in a few instances as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. References 17, 37, 47 and 53 are incomplete;</li><li>2. For reference 19, the year 2021 has been repeated twice;</li><li>3. For reference 31, the year has been mentioned following a sequence unmatched with the APA style.</li><li>4. For reference 37, the place of publication is missing;</li><li>5. For reference 44, two years are given, namely, 2019 and 2021. It requires re-checking.</li><li>6. Reference 50 needs to follow the proper format of citation.</li><li>7. Also none of the references follow the sequence of italics as provided in the APA style.</li><li>8. The article may be recommended for publication after incorporating the minor changes.</li></ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Minor revision is recommended.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nilanjana Sanyal
Department, University & Country	University of Calcutta, India