

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_123408
Title of the Manuscript:	Complementary and Alternative Medicine use Among Children with Epilepsy in Port Harcourt.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it sheds light on the high prevalence and diverse types of Complementary and Alternative Medicine (CAM) used among children with epilepsy in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. The study highlights the potential risks associated with unsupervised CAM use, including poor adherence to anti-seizure medications and the possible negative impact on treatment outcomes. The findings underscore the need for healthcare providers to be vigilant in inquiring about CAM use and to educate caregivers on the importance of adhering to prescribed treatments. I appreciate the manuscript for its thorough exploration of a significant yet under-researched area, particularly in a developing country context, which can inform future interventions and policy-making in pediatric epilepsy care.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The title of the article, "Complementary and Alternative Medicine Use Among Children with Epilepsy in Port Harcourt," is generally suitable as it accurately reflects the study's focus on the prevalence and factors influencing CAM use in this population. However, if you want to make the title more specific and impactful, you could consider an alternative such as:</p> <p>"Prevalence and Determinants of Complementary and Alternative Medicine Use Among Pediatric Epilepsy Patients in Port Harcourt, Nigeria."</p> <p>This alternative title emphasizes both the prevalence and the factors influencing CAM use, while also specifying the study location and population.</p>	

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>The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive, as it effectively summarizes the study's objectives, methods, key findings, and conclusions. However, a few improvements could make it more informative and clear:</p> <p>Clarify Study Design and Sample: The abstract briefly mentions that a "cross-sectional descriptive study" was conducted, but it could be improved by specifying that the study involved 108 children with epilepsy and their parents. This would provide clearer context about the sample size and population right from the start.</p> <p>Highlight the Implications: While the abstract mentions the potential negative effects of CAM on treatment, it could further emphasize the clinical and public health implications of these findings. For example, you could add a sentence about the importance of healthcare providers proactively discussing CAM use with caregivers.</p> <p>Mention the Statistical Analysis: The abstract does not mention the statistical methods used to analyze the data. Including a brief mention of the statistical tests (e.g., Pearson's chi-square test) would enhance the abstract's comprehensiveness.</p> <p>Refine the Conclusion: The conclusion could be slightly refined to emphasize the need for healthcare providers to be aware of CAM use and its potential impact on conventional epilepsy treatment. This would make the abstract more impactful.</p> <p>Suggested Revised Abstract: "Introduction: Epilepsy is a common neurologic disorder in children, often managed with anti-seizure medications (ASM). Despite medical treatment, seizure control may be suboptimal, leading many caregivers to seek complementary and alternative medicines (CAMs). This study aims to determine the prevalence and determinants of CAM use among children with epilepsy in Port Harcourt, Nigeria.</p> <p>Methods: A cross-sectional descriptive study was conducted with 108 children diagnosed with epilepsy and their caregivers. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire, and statistical analysis was performed using Pearson's chi-square test to identify significant associations.</p> <p>Results: The prevalence of CAM use was found to be 84.3%. Significant factors influencing CAM use included being male (P=0.01), higher seizure frequency (P=0.002), multiple ASM use (P=0.01), and the presence of comorbidities (P=0.04). The most common CAMs used were prayers, kernel oil, and crude oil.</p> <p>Conclusion: CAM use among children with epilepsy is prevalent and may negatively impact the effectiveness of conventional treatments. It is crucial for healthcare providers to proactively discuss CAM use with caregivers to optimize treatment outcomes."</p> <p>This revised abstract provides a more detailed and structured summary, enhancing its comprehensiveness and clarity.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be generally appropriate, as they follow a logical and standard format for scientific research articles. Here's a brief evaluation:</p> <p>Abstract: The abstract effectively summarizes the study. It could be enhanced with slight modifications, as previously suggested.</p> <p>Introduction: The introduction provides a clear background, the significance of the study, and outlines the research problem effectively. It sets the stage for the rest of the manuscript.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: This section appropriately details the study design, population, sampling methods, and statistical analysis. The structure is clear and allows readers to</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>understand how the study was conducted.</p> <p>Results: The results section is well-structured, with tables and figures that present the data clearly. The use of subheadings within this section helps in organizing the findings, making it easy to follow.</p> <p>Discussion: The discussion interprets the findings well and relates them to existing literature. It also highlights the study's implications, which is crucial. The structure allows for a comprehensive analysis of the results.</p> <p>Conclusion and Recommendations: The conclusion effectively summarizes the key findings and their implications. The recommendations are practical and relevant to the findings.</p> <p>References: The references are listed appropriately, though ensuring they are all formatted consistently would be important.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <p>Discussion Section: This section could benefit from further division into subsections, such as "Comparison with Other Studies," "Implications for Practice," and "Limitations of the Study." This would help in structuring the arguments and ensuring all important aspects are covered.</p> <p>Limitations: Although limitations might be discussed within the discussion, having a separate "Limitations" subsection could emphasize the constraints and how they might affect the interpretation of the results.</p> <p>Ethical Considerations: This is mentioned briefly, but it might benefit from a more detailed discussion, particularly in studies involving vulnerable populations like children.</p> <p>Overall, the manuscript's structure is appropriate, but with some minor adjustments, it could be made even more effective in communicating the research findings and their significance.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. First, the study is based on a well-defined research question that addresses a significant gap in the understanding of CAM use among children with epilepsy in a specific geographic region. The use of a cross-sectional descriptive study design, along with appropriate statistical methods, provides a solid foundation for drawing valid conclusions from the data. Additionally, the study's sample size, though modest, was determined using established statistical software, ensuring that it was adequate to detect significant associations. The manuscript also carefully considers various confounding factors and presents a thorough analysis of the determinants of CAM use, which enhances the reliability and generalizability of the findings. Overall, the methodology and analysis are sound, and the results are presented in a clear and logical manner, contributing to the manuscript's scientific credibility.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript appear to be generally sufficient and relevant to the study's focus on CAM use among children with epilepsy. They cover a broad range of topics, including the prevalence of CAM use, its implications, and specific factors influencing its use in different contexts. However, a few observations and suggestions could further strengthen the manuscript:</p> <p>Recency: While some references are recent, including studies from 2023, a few others are slightly older. To ensure the manuscript reflects the most current research, it might be beneficial to include more recent studies, especially those published within the last 3-5 years.</p> <p>Diversity of Sources: The references include studies from various regions, but adding more references from similar low- and middle-income settings, especially those</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>focusing on pediatric epilepsy and CAM, could provide additional context and comparison.</p> <p>Additional References: Here are a few suggestions for additional references that could enhance the manuscript:</p> <p>Global Reviews on CAM in Pediatric Epilepsy: Studies or reviews that provide a global perspective on CAM use in pediatric epilepsy could offer valuable insights and comparisons.</p> <p>Recent Studies on CAM Safety and Efficacy: Including recent meta-analyses or systematic reviews on the safety and efficacy of CAM in epilepsy could help contextualize the study's findings within the broader scientific discourse.</p> <p>Policy and Practice Guidelines: References to recent guidelines or recommendations from neurological or pediatric associations regarding CAM use could strengthen the discussion on clinical implications.</p> <p>Overall, while the current references are adequate, the inclusion of a few more recent and diverse sources could further enhance the manuscript's scientific rigor and relevance.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is mostly clear and understandable, but there are a few areas where minor improvements could enhance clarity and readability:</p> <p>Grammar and Syntax: There are occasional grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that could be smoothed out to improve the flow of the text. For example, some sentences are lengthy and could be broken down for better clarity.</p> <p>Technical Terminology: The use of technical terms is appropriate for the target audience, and the concepts are generally well-explained. However, ensuring that all abbreviations are defined on their first use would enhance readability, especially for readers who may not be familiar with specific terms.</p> <p>Consistency: There are a few inconsistencies in the use of tenses and formatting, particularly in the tables and references sections. Ensuring consistent formatting and tense usage throughout the manuscript would improve its professionalism.</p> <p>Clarity: While the manuscript is mostly clear, a few sentences could be rephrased for better comprehension. For example, simplifying complex sentences and ensuring that the subject and verb agree in each sentence would help make the text more accessible.</p> <p>Overall, the language is adequate for scholarly communication, but a careful review and minor editing could further polish the manuscript, making it even more suitable for publication in a scientific journal.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>None!</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Reza Azizimalamiri
Department, University & Country	Golestan Medical, Educational, and Research Center, Ahvaz Jundishapur University of Medical Sciences, Iran