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Reviewer’s report:

The use of alternative medicine for hypertension in Buikwe and Mukono districts of Uganda: A cross sectional is an interesting topic in the field of hypertension management. Although the manuscript is well written there are some aspects that will strengthen the quality of the manuscript.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The introduction is too brief and inadequate. It does not address hypertension as a disease which includes how hypertension treatment and control is realized in sub-Saharan Africa. The literature review on the state of alternative medicine use is inadequate in the background. The concept of alternative and forms of alternative medicine use should be clearly stated in the background/introduction. Authors should cite previous studies from Africa that studies the prevalence of use of alternative medicine in hypertension. Only two of their citations are from Africa and one notable one on the authors missed which is very similar to their study that used a community based approach is the study by Osamor and Owumi (2010) on “complementary and alternative medicine in the management of hypertension in an urban Nigerian Community”. It will also be nice and interesting to compare and contrast the findings from this manuscript prevalence (as well as other findings) with these studies.

2. The author’s stated objective was to estimate “prevalence” but their sample size was based on a different outcome “determinants of alternative medicine use”. Authors should please clarify.

3. It seems that the authors just lifted what were stated in the questionnaire as headings for their tables. The table titles and categories of responses are poorly done. They should be interpreted to convey proper meaning to the reader.

Minor essential revisions
1. It seems ~92% of the sample use modern medicine and ~52% use alternative medicine, with only 4% using alternative medicine alone. It would be useful to comment on this pattern i.e. use of modern medicine was nearly universal and alternative medicine was not used alone but as an adjunct to modern medicine. The fact that so few use alternative medicine alone means that they do not believe alternative medicine “on its own” is able to control their hypertension.

2. I am just curious as to why there is a high proportion of missing data. Also the authors should replace “no education” with “no formal education” and I also suggest that the proportion for primary education be stated clearly.

3. It is my advice that after responding to the comments from the reviewers that the authors should endeavour to seek the services of an English editor before consideration for publication

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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