



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_63735
Title of the Manuscript:	Public perceptions of cupping therapy (Hijama) and whether it will be chosen over donating blood
Type of the Article	Research

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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wet cupping technique or Hijama procedure has to be explained in detail. 2. Author has written about different techniques of Hijama in Middle East and Korea, Germany, China. It will be good if the techniques can be elaborated. 3. As the researcher is basically explaining the preference of participants for Hijama or blood donation. All the participants were analysed and asked about Hijama through questionnaires but no method is explaining the effect of variables like fear, age or gender on blood donation. So actual preference cannot be estimated. Kindly add this to your manuscript. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the result portion there are few parts with grammatical errors because of that the actual meaning of the sentence is not coming up. Below is an example of such sentence. Kindly reconstruct it. "When we asked what symptoms could be treated with cupping, most of the respondents considered being lethargic (44.8%) as the main reason that drive them to perform cupping". 2. In conclusion part it has been said that there is high knowledge of Saudi population towards cupping technique however in the manuscript it is been said only around 48% population knows about it. Statement is contradictory. Kindly give a better conclusion. 	
Optional/General comments	This present research is a good, if the above mentioned changes is done then it is good enough to be published.	

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:	Saraswati Prasad Mishra
Department, University & Country	Chhattisgarh Swami Vivekanand Technical University, India