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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revision
1. The Abstract should include more information about the trial, such as outcomes, trial design including blinding and significant results.
2. There are 3 primary outcomes in this trial (Methods: Outcome Measures). Thus, there would be a multiple testing problem. Correction for the multiple comparisons must be considered. Otherwise, clarify the primary end point.

Minor Essential Revisions
Methods
A. Patient and Recruitment
1. The second line of ‘Patient and Recruitment’ in Methods section, the definition of mild type 2 diabetes is confusing (i.e. 2 hr plasma glucose load level # 7.8 < 11.1).
2. For randomization, what is the exact meaning of ‘simple block’? Please describe the exact block size and the randomization methods such as computer generated or envelope method.
3. Describe the allocation ratio planned and who were blinded.
4. Selection criteria should be explained in detail.

B. Herbal Intervention and Treatment Schedules
1. How many capsules were instructed to be administered?

C. Outcome Measures
1. Obesity itself is a vague parameter for the outcome measurement. Please clarify the endpoint ‘obesity’, such as weight and BMI.

D. Statistical Analyses
1. At statistical analyses section, the follow up period is describe as 8 weeks, however, it needs to be expressed in advance in ‘Methods’ section.

Results
A. Fasting blood glucose
1. Explain what variables were adjusted for the analysis.
2. The values of fasting blood glucose in two groups do not match with the
numbers in Table 3.
3. For the paragraph, that describes for the 2hr post prandial blood glucose levels, ‘Table 2’ should be ‘Table 3’.

B. Insulin
1. In the abstract conclusions, it is explained that the insulin measures were improved, however, in Table 3, only ‘insulin’ and index for insulin resistance (HOMA-IR) differences are statistically significant. The detail of the result will be helpful to understand while reading the abstract.
2. It is expressed that ‘shown in Table 2’, but, in Table 2, there are no figures of 22.1±25.9 and 11.6±5.5 for mean levels of insulin item.

C. Cholesterol
1. The p-value of between groups might be only the one, however, two p-values are shown in the manuscript.

dec.
1. The title of ‘Introduction’ is missing.
2. In Table 2, showing ‘n’ and percentage (%) would be preferable.

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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