

### **Editor's Comment:**

I have read the revised manuscript and found that:

1.first reviewer Lucia Stančiaková, MD, PhD. Rated 9 and changes have been made

2.second reviewer **Wagaye Alemu Zenebe** Rated 7 :

**It needs clarity about what type of clinical trial study used, on analysis technique: it is better to clear whether assumptions are checked or not, and state post hock test was done or not after ANOVA..... I could not find this correction in the revised article**

Report exact p-value rather than saying  $<0.05$ ....I could not find the exact p-value on results in the revised article. The guideline for p value reporting should follow as below:

The 6th edition of the APA style manual (American Psychological Association, 2010) states the following on the topic of reporting p-values:

*"When reporting p values, report exact p values (e.g.,  $p = .031$ ) to two or three decimal places. However, report p values less than .001 as  $p < .001$ . The tradition of reporting p values in the form  $p < .10$ ,  $p < .05$ ,  $p < .01$ , and so forth, was appropriate in a time when only limited tables of critical values were available."*

Please indicate to the authors to correct both of the above reviewer recommendations before proceeding with publication at your discretion.

### **Editor's Details:**

Dr. Adlina Binti Suleiman

Professor of Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Defence Health, National Defence University Of Malaysia, Malaysia