

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>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)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>No (Multifunctional Approach of Ayurved towards Parkinson's)</p> <p>No-Copied</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Can be written in a better way and approach</p> <p>Not as per the requirement for the Journal</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The abstract should summarize the case, the problem it addresses, and the message it conveys. Missing Discussion This is the most important part of the case report; the part that will convince the journal that the case is publication worthy. Conclusions seems biased and should be based on the facts and data, Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without hypothesis Narrative of the episode of care (including tables and figures as needed).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presenting concerns (chief complaints) and relevant demographic information. • Clinical findings: describe the relevant past medical history, pertinent co-morbidities, and important physical examination (PE) findings. • Diagnostic assessments: discuss diagnostic testing and results, a differential diagnosis, and the diagnosis. • Therapeutic interventions: describe the types of intervention (pharmacologic, surgical, preventive, lifestyle) and how the interventions were administered (dosage, strength, duration, and frequency). Tables or figures may be useful. • Follow-up and outcomes: describe the clinical course of the episode of care during follow-up visits including (1) intervention modification, interruption, or discontinuation; (2) intervention adherence and how this was assessed; and (3) adverse effects or unanticipated events. <p>Informed Consent and Patient Perspective. The patient should provide informed consent (including a patient perspective) and the author should provide this information if requested</p> <p>A short acknowledgements section should mention funding support or conflicts of interest, if applicable</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sushant Sud
Department, University & Country	Institute of Teaching and Research in Ayurved, India