

Review of: "Traditional phytotherapies used by the midwives for the treatment of uterine prolapse in district Kathua, JKUT, India"

Aïmen Abbassi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I thank the editor for the opportunity given by reviewing this article. The whole manuscript is well written. My comments are listed below:

- please add the aim of the paper at the end of the introduction
- please specify on all the manuscript that the midwives recruited for this study are "traditional midwives"
- p5: "as this technique is considered best when the number of informants is less or their category is specific", I propose to replace the term less by few or small.
- it is important to highlight in a limits paragraph that the snowball method is not probabilistic and the sample may be not representative. This sampling method may induce a bias of selection that may impact heavily the results. For example, it is possible to say that a first midwife can advise to recruit a second with a link between the two of the master-learner type. So, we will find the same care techniques including medicinal plants.
- the formula is missed (last line of the methods section)
- only 25 midwives were recruited. I think that the number is quite insufficient. Since it is a population survey, I invite the authors to consider a main event such as the frequency of the traditional midwives in the Kathua district.
- "All informants are female": it's obvious
- please associate in all the manuscript the number with the percentage (n,%).
- please give the mean of the age
- how did the authors qualify the expertise of the midwives?
- p7, discussion section: "They were preferred over the doctors because, being women": I suppose that there are others factors such as accessibility, cultural context, ...
- I think that it is essential to discuss the main chemical composition of the various plants cited in this word. For exemple, *Quercus infectoria* is rich in tannins which are tonic.