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Manimbulu Nlooto

Thank you for consideration of my manuscript for publication in your journal. I have carefully taken into consideration all the constructive comments from the editor and reviewers.

Comments from the editor

Copyediting has been done to improve the style of written English. Standard error for proportion has been corrected and included in tables 1 and 2 in the manuscript text file.
Reviewer #1: N Malangu

Major revisions

1. Remove all tests referring to and about “standard error and relative error”; rather present mean values with standard deviation and percentages or proportions with no other added values. The presentation of standard error and relative error is unnecessary and inappropriate for the data presented.

   • Although standard error is not commonly reported, this measure can be used as well as 95% confidence intervals to report points estimates. I chose to keep standard error as per associate editor’s first comments.

2. The reasons for use and non-disclosure could be well presented in a table or histogram.

   • The presentation of reasons for both use and non-disclosure has been improved. Figures 1, 2, and 3 illustrate the reasons in the manuscript text file.

3. Sentences revision e.g. in the abstract conclusion, the second sentence (line 27)

   • The abstract has been revised as per reviewer’s comments.

Minor revisions

1. It would be good for the authors to find out the scientific names of plants cited such as for garlic, cancer bush…and write them correctly.

   • I chose to report verbatim the list of names used by respondents.

Level of interest: an article of importance in its field.

• No comments.

Quality of written English: needs some language corrections before being published

• Corrections have been made throughout the paper where necessary.

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

• No comments

Declaration of competing interests: None

• No comments

Reviewer #2: Betty Namuddu

Reviewer’s report

Major compulsory and minor revisions

• I am afraid that the reviewer came back on the same points already addressed in the previous reports in both major and minor revisions. I politely choose not to repeat the same responses due to redundant requests from the reviewer.

Level of interest: An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal.
Quality of written English
• No comments

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
• No comments

Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests in this manuscript.
• No comments