

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_118281
Title of the Manuscript:	Acupuncture Readiness Attitude Scale (ARAS): An Informal Screener for Patient Suitability for Acupuncture Treatment
Type of the Article	Method 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>)

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>1. This article on acupuncture is relevant to healthcare and to the scientific community. The consideration of placebo and sham acupuncture shows extensive literature review and an openness to look at every aspect of the topic. I commend the novel creation of the Acupuncture Readiness Attitude Scale (ARAS) by the authors. My little concern is the number of questions in the questionnaire – 40 items. However, the users' feedback to the authors, as they have nicely requested, will provide the needed answer.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate comprising the historic perspective and development of acupuncture. The details provided will ensure enable a novice in this field to follow the discussion.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are adequate. A good proportion of the references are very recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>A good article that will prompt many reactions, feedbacks and further research.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chinyerem Cynthia Nwachukwu
Department, University & Country	Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Nigeria