

### Review Form 3

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>                                 |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJMAH_123815  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Marma Sharira as the Contribution of Ayurveda to Traumatology, a Short Review</b> |
| Type of the Article      |  |

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|---|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.                        | There is no clarity in this manuscript. Beating about the bush and no specific point is highlighted or conveyed throughout the manuscript |   |
| Is the title of the article suitable?<br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)   | Title needs to be clear and specific as what the author wants to emphasize?   |   |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.   | Needs clarity, very ambiguous   |   |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  | Needs to be highlighted with proper references. Too non-specific  |   |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. |   |   |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.   | Explanation with respect to references need to be addressed   |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  |   |   |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?   |   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  | Only after major revision, the manuscript shall be considered and not with this content   |   |

#### PART 2:

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> (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? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) |  |

#### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | C. Anbarasi                              |
| Department, University & Country | Siddha Central Research Institute, India |

Review Form 3