

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_123304
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of “Preventive Treatment of Disease” from Traditional Chinese Medicine in Public Health Emergencies
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Was the scope and purpose of the review clearly defined? The purpose of the paper was stated.</p> <p>Do the authors have appropriate knowledge and expertise to write this review? Based on the manuscript I'm not sure if the authors are qualified to discuss the subject</p> <p>Is the subject matter relevant to your practice? The subject addressed is relevant.</p> <p>Was a review of the literature carried out? If so was the methodology explicit? The authors described how they searched for studies but did not present the results well; it's incomplete, although for narrative reviews a flowchart is not necessary, a more thorough description of the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the studies taken into discussion .</p> <p>How recent was the search? They conducted the search until 2024, so , they included the most recent studies on the subject.</p> <p>Did the authors include a range of suitable evidence? Did the papers included address relevant questions and have an appropriate study design? The study design is not properly described. The evidence is presented in a vague manner.</p> <p>Have the authors critically appraised the evidence? No</p> <p>Did the authors discuss areas of uncertainty and controversy?Have differing viewpoints and knowledge gaps been discussed? No</p> <p>Is there any evidence of bias in the evidence included or its interpretation? There does not seem to be evidence of bias in the paper.</p> <p>Are all the important aspects of the subject considered? Important aspects are vaguely discussed.</p> <p>What are the main take home messages from the review? Based on literature retrieval and comprehensive analysis, the study found that the role of Chinese medicine in public health emergencies can be summarized into three aspects.</p> <p>1Having read the review, are there any papers that you want to read? Reading the paper makes me want to read all the cited articles because it seems to me that perhaps some ideas and data were overlooked.</p> <p>Can information from the review be applied to your practice?</p> <p>Is the review relevant to your patient population? The conclusions are too general to be applicable.</p> <p>I would recommend to the authors to review their paper in accordance to EBVM Toolkit 14 Narrative review checklist or SANRA scale.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Angela Tudor
Department, University & Country	Romania