



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_26915
Title of the Manuscript:	Traditional medicine: knowledge, attitude, and practice of medical students and their mothers in Tabuk city, Saudi Arabia.
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>1. In the study title only mentioned about the TM but in the Objectives mentioned both TM and MM</p> <p>2. The study design wrongly interpreted (qualitative) in the abstract. It's Quantitative descriptive cross sectional study.</p> <p>3. Unnecessary key words to be excluded (students, mothers, Saudi Arabia.)</p> <p>4. The introduction is very vast, can be split into background and significance for study. The title and introduction material is not correlated; need to add related new information.</p> <p>5. The title of the study is not fulfilled by objectives, and tools ie, not explore the KAP and no need to compare participants, need to get the data regarding the association with research variables.</p> <p>6. The tool '10' item questions is not absolutely related to explore 'KAP' is only assess the awareness of uses about TM and MM.</p> <p>7. In analysis, mentioned in the qualitative variables is not apt for this study, it's to be mentioned as research variables.</p> <p>8. The scoring key is not mentioned in any part of study. ie., regarding knowledge adequate / inadequate, Attitude- concern positive or negative/ Practice- need to interpret as how much / often students and mothers were using.</p> <p>9. In analysis there is no clear view of the demographic variables of the participants.</p> <p>10. Where they used Yates correction test ?</p> <p>11. In discussion, the very huge unnecessary and irrelevant literatures are added. It's not give clear view of the study. (Literatures are related to the tools and objectives only, not</p>	<p>1. Title and running title both modified.</p> <p>2. Corrected this unintended mistake.</p> <p>3. We deleted these three words.</p> <p>4. We included relevant info about TM and MM and we added some more info related to KAP. We wanted introduction to be comprehensive but pertinent to the topic so that readers can benefit (no space restriction in OAJ).</p> <p>5. Now when title is modified, objectives match with it (title).modified</p> <p>6. We did not assess any item of KAP in absolute terms, which is a difficult exercise and concept. We know that awareness and knowledge are two discrete entities, however we imply here knowledge-awareness dimension.</p> <p>7. we corrected this unintended mistake</p> <p>8. No scoring was done because most questions were answered in yes or no!</p> <p>9. Demographic data of participants was not collected.</p> <p>10. In Table 1, item 9 and 10 where the cells sizes (>25%) were less than 5.</p> <p>Some of your points are included in the caveat of this study. Knowledge</p> <p>11, 12, 13 points none of the other two reviewers suggested. SIR in open access journals, the space constraint, and silliest ideology of closed access j does not apply. Nothing is unnecessary and irrelevant. We deleted the word summary and used conclusion, then both of your points are obvious</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>in the various aspects of TM and MM) 12. Instead of summary its need to be split into conclusion and recommendations will give good impression to the study. 13. Reference list need to be reduced.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. Need to do grammatical corrections throughout article. 2. The words to be used appropriately ie., 'auto' medication instead of this can use 'self' medication. 3. Select the reviews to be more significant which is apt for the study title and objectives.</p> <p>Plagiarism issue: 93% originality , 6% plagiarised and 1% referenced. No ethical issues involved in the study.</p>	<p>1. Taken care of 2. No difference between auto and self we have now used both auto or self. 3. Studies included in this study in the introduction and discussions are highly pertinent and relevant. We have addressed the issue of ethic carefully. No risk to participants was involved. We feel 96% originality is good enough. Furthermore, we do not want to go into the details of plagiarism. One of the criterions of plagiarism is cut and paste of "more than 3 words".</p>
Optional/ General comments	<p>Need to be revised in all areas of the article. If they want to continue of the study with same tool ,change the study title as "Evaluate awareness of TM and MM among medical college students and their mothers in Tabuk city at Saudi Arabia "</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To assess the level of awareness of TM and MM in medical college students and their mothers. 2. To associate the level of awareness of TM and MM among selected demographic variables of medical college students and their mothers <p>Scoring key : For example : 7-10 – Adequate awareness 4- 6 –Average 0-4 - inadequate</p>	<p>We have changed the title and have also taken into consideration the healthy points of other two reviewers. They have not suggested any of these points, which you are emphasizing upon. Sorry for not complying with some of your suggestions.</p> <p>Thank you very much for your highly critical, healthy comments! Modifications are highlighted in YELLOW</p>