

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_104614
Title of the Manuscript:	Practice and Perception of Traditional Medicine Practitioners towards Challenges facing Traditional Medicine Practice in Nigeria: A Pilot Study
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The study team's efforts are appreciated.</p> <p>1. This manuscript on challenges faced by Traditional Medicine Practitioners (TMPs) in Nigeria fills a crucial gap, offering insights into improving healthcare delivery, regulation, and collaboration. Its findings provide a valuable resource for policymakers and researchers striving to enhance traditional medicine practices.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is interesting. It is appropriate and adequately informative.</p> <p>3. a. Abstract: Method section is not informative. Method section needs more explanation. b. which tests were used for? It needs to explain. What about calculating sample size? C. please add key words based on Mesh</p> <p>4. Introduction: Please mention in the introduction what percentage of people in Nigeria use complementary and traditional medicine.</p> <p>5. Method:a. Explain how to select samples. How was the randomization done? b. More details about the used questionnaire. Such as reliability, validity and what the questions were like. c. You've mentioned that a semi-structured questionnaire was designed and administered to the respondents. It would be helpful to provide some details about the content of the questionnaire. What were the main sections or categories of questions included? Were there specific types of questions, such as Likert-scale questions, open-ended questions, or multiple-choice questions? d. Informed Consent: While you've mentioned that informed consent was obtained from the respondents, you could elaborate a bit more on the informed consent process. For instance, you might want to describe how the purpose of the study was explained to the respondents and how their consent was documented (e.g., signed consent forms, verbal consent, etc.). e. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria: It's great that you've mentioned the inclusion criteria for respondents. However, it might be beneficial to also briefly mention any specific exclusion criteria you applied, if applicable.</p> <p>6. Discussion: a..While you have included some citations to support your points, consider expanding the use of citations to further strengthen your arguments and provide context for your statements. b. At the end of the discussion, write a paragraph about the limitations of your research.</p> <p>7. 6. Please use update references. Some of them are under 5 years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>suitable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pouran Varvani Farahani
Department, University & Country	Near East University, Cyprus