

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: JNHM-121

Title: *Ayurvedic CDC Multimodal Protocol for Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: Glycaemic and Cardiometabolic Outcomes in 55 Combined Patients – A Multi-Site Retrospective Observational Study*

Recommendation:
 Accept as it is
 ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

| Rating | Excel. | Good | Fair | Poor |
|----------------|--------|------|------|------|
| Originality | | ✓ | | |
| Techn. Quality | | ✓ | | |
| Clarity | | ✓ | | |
| Significance | ✓ | | | |

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study:

- The study addresses an important clinical problem in diabetes management
- Multi site data improve the diversity of the study population
- Clear objectives and well explained methodology
- Appropriate statistical analysis was used for outcome assessment
- Clinical outcomes are presented in a structured manner
- The discussion relates findings with existing literature
- The limitations of the study are acknowledged by the authors

Weakness of the study:

- The retrospective design limits causal interpretation
- The sample size remains modest despite pooled analysis
- No control group was included for comparison
- Follow up duration was not uniform across participants
- Some laboratory parameters had incomplete paired data
- Ethical clearance should be stated more clearly if applicable
- Minor grammatical and formatting errors require correction

Reviewers Comments:

The manuscript evaluates the effectiveness of an Ayurvedic multimodal protocol for patients with type 2 diabetes using pooled data from multiple clinical sites. The topic is clinically relevant, and the study design is appropriate for generating real world evidence. The methodology is adequately described, and the statistical analysis is suitable for the available data. The results are presented clearly and are supported by tables and appropriate interpretation. The manuscript would benefit from a clearer statement regarding ethical clearance and informed consent if these were obtained. Minor grammatical and formatting corrections are also needed to improve readability and overall presentation. The retrospective design, absence of a control group, variable follow up duration, and incomplete data for some parameters should be discussed in greater detail as important limitations. Despite these concerns, the study contributes useful preliminary evidence and provides a valuable basis for future prospective controlled studies. Overall, the manuscript is suitable for publication after minor revision.

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to be an original research work, and no obvious evidence of prior publication was identified during this review. There are no apparent signs of plagiarism in the submitted version. However, a routine similarity check using standard plagiarism detection software is recommended before final acceptance to ensure compliance with publication ethics.