

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JOCAMR_128740 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Community Perceptions of Hypertension Treatment in Vrymans Erven, Berbice, Guyana |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | This manuscript provides a critical exploration of the integration of traditional and pharmaceutical remedies in hypertension management, specifically within a rural Guyanese context. Its significance for the scientific community lies in several key aspects: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Bridging Cultural and Biomedical Knowledge2. The research provides valuable insights into the treatment preferences and challenges faced by individuals in a resource-constrained environment. This can inform global health initiatives aimed at improving hypertension outcomes in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Comment: The title is clear and reflects the study's focus. However, consider emphasizing the dual approach (traditional and pharmaceutical remedies) to make the scope more apparent. Suggestion: You might reframe as " <i>Community Perceptions of Traditional and Pharmaceutical Hypertension Treatments in Vrymans Erven, Berbice, Guyana.</i> " | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Comment: The abstract succinctly covers objectives, methods, key findings, and implications.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The abstract mentions frequencies of themes but does not connect them to broader implications clearly. Consider summarizing the key takeaways more explicitly in the conclusion.• Replace "rich qualitative dataset" with a more specific description, such as "<i>diverse perspectives from ten hypertensive individuals.</i>" | |
| <p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p> | <p>Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the following considerations:</p> <p>1. Scientific Rigor</p> <p>The manuscript employs a qualitative research methodology that is appropriate for the study's objectives, which focus on understanding cultural and personal preferences for managing hypertension. The use of semi-structured interviews, purposive sampling, and thematic analysis is well-suited for exploring subjective experiences and perspectives.</p> <p>2. Validity of Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sampling: The purposive and snowball sampling methods are valid for qualitative research and align with the goal of capturing diverse perspectives.• Data Collection: The use of semi-structured interviews and a reflexive diary ensures comprehensive data collection, minimizing bias and providing rich context.• Data Analysis: Thematic analysis is a standard approach in qualitative research, and the themes derived are well-supported by participant quotes. <p>3. Results and Interpretations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The findings align with existing literature on the dual use of pharmaceutical and traditional remedies in chronic disease management.• Themes such as "Preference for Pharmaceutical Remedies," "Integrated Approach to Treatment," and "Accessibility and Availability" are relevant and backed by direct participant quotations. <p>4. Integration of Existing Knowledge</p> <p>The discussion integrates the study's findings with previous research, demonstrating consistency with global and regional patterns in hypertension management. Citations from credible sources reinforce the study's interpretations.</p> <p>5. Ethical Considerations</p> <p>The study adheres to ethical research practices, including securing informed consent and ensuring confidentiality for participants. This ensures the scientific and ethical integrity of the research process.</p> <p>6. Study Limitations</p> <p>While scientifically sound, the study has inherent limitations, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A small sample size (10 participants), which is typical for qualitative research but limits generalizability.• Potential bias from the snowball sampling method, as participants may have similar backgrounds or perspectives. | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited geographical focus, which restricts the applicability of findings to other contexts. <p>7. Scientific Accuracy</p> <p>The definitions, statistical references, and contextual framing (e.g., global burden of hypertension, cultural practices) are accurate and align with widely accepted knowledge and guidelines, such as those from the World Health Organization (WHO).</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct. It adheres to appropriate qualitative research methodologies, provides well-supported findings, and integrates these findings with existing knowledge. However, its limitations, such as small sample size and localized focus, should be clearly stated to provide a balanced understanding of the study's implications.</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> | <p>Comment : References are diverse and relevant to the topic.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure all references are formatted consistently according to journal guidelines (e.g., some DOIs are included, others are not). Verify whether all in-text citations match the reference list. | |
| <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>General Observations</p> <p>1. Language and Grammar:</p> <p>The manuscript is well-written overall, but there are occasional minor grammatical errors. For example, ensure consistent use of tenses.</p> <p>Simplify technical terms where possible to improve accessibility for a broader audience.</p> <p>2. Figures and Tables:</p> <p>Tables are informative but could benefit from improved formatting for clarity. Consider bolding headings or using shading for sub-categories.</p> <p>3. Original Contribution:</p> <p>The manuscript addresses a unique blend of cultural and medical practices in hypertension management, making a valuable contribution. Highlighting this more prominently in the abstract and introduction would strengthen the paper.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</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: | Gautam Prasad Chaudhary |
| Department, University & Country | Pokhara University, Nepal |