Editor's Comment:

I have read the revised manuscript and found that:
1. first reviewer Lucia Stančiaková, MD, PhD. Rated 9 and changes have been made
2. second reviewer Wagaye Alemu Zenebe Rated 7:

It needs clarity about what type of clinical trial study used, on analysis technique: it is better to clear whether assumptions are checked or not, and state post hock test was done or not after ANOVA...... I could not find this correction in the revised article

Report exact p-value rather than saying <0.05....I could not find the exact p-value on results in the revised article. The guideline for p value reporting should follow as below:

The 6th edition of the APA style manual (American Psychological Association, 2010) states the following on the topic of reporting p-values:

“When reporting p values, report exact p values (e.g., p = .031) to two or three decimal places. However, report p values less than .001 as p < .001. The tradition of reporting p values in the form p < .10, p < .05, p < .01, and so forth, was appropriate in a time when only limited tables of critical values were available.”

Please indicate to the authors to correct both of the above reviewer recommendations before proceeding with publication at your discretion.
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