

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_98937
Title of the Manuscript:	Ayurvedic Management of Parkinson's disease: A Case Report
Type of the Article	Case study

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, the manuscript is scientific. - Yes, the title is concise and clear. - Yes, the abstract is well structured but make some small correction I refer to the comments on the manuscript file. - Yes, but please I suggest that the author(s) should more information on subsection: introduction. - Yes, this manuscript is scientifically interesting. - Yes, please author(s) more citations should be cited. - On the method subsection, please include the patients' medical history on the first date he reported at P. D. Patel Ayurveda hospital. - Please give some brief introduction at the results and discussion subsection. - Please author(s) I suggest you should revise discussion section since it is not clear at all, and also try to compare your findings with some findings from the literatures. - Please elaborate more on conclusion, what is in the manuscript is too shallow and has no future. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please correct some few grammar and errors. 	
Optional/General comments		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The manuscript is publishable upon complying with the minor corrections. 	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Patrick Onen
Department, University & Country	University of Kerala, India