

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_128838
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of patients' perceptions of safety and efficacy of herbal and conventional type 2 diabetes treatments in Nairobi, Kenya.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured and well-discussed. Literature was adequately reviewed on the topic to a large extent. The study provides useful information in an area of public health interest that is less researched (i.e., herbal medicine use in among patients with chronic conditions).</p> <p>A few corrections/ explanations and/or clarifications are however needed in some areas of the manuscript. For instance;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Author stated in the conclusion that “treatment-related, health accessibility and individual factors influence patients’ satisfaction with medications”. It will be much helpful if author specifies the treatment-related, health accessibility and individual factors that were found in the study to influence patients’ satisfaction with medications. 2. Under the caption “Patterns of responses on undesirable side effects domain”, author reported that “Significantly higher number of participants on conventional antidiabetic treatments at Kenyatta National Hospital indicated that their medicines interfered to a great extent (a score of 4) with their physical (p<0.001), leisure (p<0.001) and daily (p<0.001) activities compared to those at the herbal clinic”, which to me, was an indication that patients on convention treatment to a large extent, had decreased satisfaction regarding the undesirable side effects experienced compared to those on herbal treatment. However, under “COMPARISON OF TOTAL DOMAIN SCORES ACROSS THE STUDY SITES”, author reported that “Patients at the herbal clinic had significantly higher total scores in their perception of undesirable side effects compared to those on conventional glucose-lowering agents (p<0.001)”, which gives the indication that patients on herbal treatment herbal treatment had decreased satisfaction regarding undesirable side effects experienced compared to conventional medication. Author should therefore throw more light on these two conflicting reports from the study. 3. Under the caption “DETERMINANTS OF SATISFACTION WITH UNDESIRABLE SIDE EFFECTS OF MEDICINES”, author stated that ,“Patients experienced a 2.074 increase in their satisfaction scores on the side effects domain (95% CI=0.982, 3.165, p<0.001)”. In the results Table 5 however, the said experience of side effect was specific to “Numbness”. Author therefore needs to re-write statement to reflect same. 4. Under the caption “Participants’ responses on efficacy of medicines domain”, author wrote; “As shown in Table 2, a significantly higher number of patients had higher ratings (a score of 4) for all the items in this domain compared to those on herbal treatments.” To make the statement much clearer, I suggest that the statement should be re-written as; “As shown in Table 2, a significantly higher number of patients on conventional treatment had higher ratings (a score of 4) for all the items in this domain compared to those on herbal treatments.” 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, title is suitable</p>	

Review Form 3

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.	Yes, abstract is comprehensive	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, manuscript is scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and recent.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	In general, this manuscript is scientifically sound and of good quality, and will be very useful to the scientific community, except that the few comments/ concerns raised above needs to be adequately addressed.	

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:	Philip lartey
Department, University & Country	Eastern regional hospital, Ghana