

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_117532
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of A Mobile Application in Yoga Therapy for Elderly with Hypertension
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, hypertension is an important non communicable illness and holistic management through yoga and diet as the authors propose may be valuable as a non pharmacological intervention.</p> <p>Suitable.</p> <p>The font specification after keywords demonstrates an oversight and would need to be corrected.</p> <p>Sections seem mostly appropriate and the use of photographs along with asanas is well presented. Results and discussion section present results but there is no discussion. The results could be presented more comprehensively. There are no references included in the discussion or conclusion. Definitions and acronyms are placed last, however there is not content there. The authors should however, check the terms such as "simple hip opener pose" which are not accepted as standardized yoga terms.</p> <p>The inclusion of protocols add great value to the paper however, it falls short of consistency and detail. Sanskrit names and/or English names of poses, (e.g. Chandra bhedana, or moon piercing and surya bhedana) duration of holding, breathing patterns, benefits (which need to be attributed to texts or properly referenced) and caveats and cautions should be clearly mentioned. While the author claim 40 experts confirmed organization and sequence – it would be good to see the summation of their remarks or rubrics included. Without this information, there does not seem academic merit or possibility of replication and wider relevance or use. The other calculations seem</p> <p>While there are 10 references included, some such as reference number 5 effects of hatha (incorrect spelling in the paper) yoga in secondary students do not seem relevant, the word "thai" is incorrectly referenced or is incomplete.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>While the reader can get a general sense of the content, language -use of informal terms such as elderly guys (2, line 7), shifting between present, future and past tenses such as 2.2 2.3 2.5 2.6, spelling such as groyne for groin, and terms as casese warrant editing and rewriting. Invoking parasympathetic nervous system in point 16 is incomplete and incorrect. Claims such as colonic function is enhanced needs further validation There is no such thing as Knees swing pose (point 15)</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>To publish a 25 page long paper may not adhere to the publication word limit. The authors may consider adding all protocols after the paper is done as additional information. Not all graphs may need to be included.</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:	Sujata Cowlagi
Department, University & Country	Singapore