



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_48430
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison and effectiveness of complementary and alternative medicine as against conventional medicine in the treatment and management of type 2 diabetes
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The references are not in accordance with SDI Authors' guideline. Revise them.</p> <p>There are lots of grammatical errors in the manuscript.</p> <p>The introduction needs to be modified.</p> <p>The method is not robustly reported. The way it is, one cannot reproduce the study. Provide us with all the information that regards this report. Like what are their age brackets? Diets? Full conditions for the selection of these subjects.</p> <p>The result is difficult to understand and interpret. There is no point combining the mean and sd of all groups as seen in table 1 as you were expected to compare from the title.</p> <p>Secondly, the table 2, the number are not all the same, did you use all the subjects? Why not report individual group result. This will lead to the removal of table 1 but present the study better. Table 2 cannot be easily comprehended.</p> <p>This has affected the discussion section.</p> <p>The conclusion is to be revised. Focus on the outcome of the comparative studies and not the liver enzymes.</p>	<p>Authors are very much appreciated the comments of the reviewer for our manuscript</p> <p>We have effected the correction as per the instruction</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Attend to the raised issues.	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	