

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_123815
Title of the Manuscript:	Marma Sharira as the Contribution of Ayurveda to Traumatology, a Short Review
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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This manuscript presents a comprehensive review of Marma Sharira and its contributions to modern traumatology, integrating traditional Ayurvedic concepts with contemporary medical practices. It is valuable to the scientific community because it offers a novel perspective on trauma care by bridging ancient wisdom and modern techniques. The review could stimulate further research and discussion on integrating holistic approaches into mainstream medicine, enhancing both theoretical understanding and practical applications in trauma management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it clearly reflects the content of the manuscript. However, to make it more engaging and specific, consider a slight modification: "Integrating Marma Sharira: Ayurveda's Insights into Modern Traumatology."	
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.	The abstract provides a clear overview of the manuscript's objectives and findings. It succinctly outlines the relevance of Marma Sharira to trauma care and its potential benefits. However, adding a brief mention of key findings or examples of modern applications could enhance the abstract's comprehensiveness.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The paper is well-organized, with clear sections that address the historical perspective, anatomical implications, relevance to modern trauma care, and challenges. This logical flow aids in understanding the integration of Ayurvedic concepts with contemporary practices	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. It accurately presents the principles of Marma Sharira and effectively connects them with modern traumatology. The review draws from relevant Ayurvedic texts and contemporary studies, offering a balanced and well-supported discussion. The integration of traditional and modern perspectives demonstrates the manuscript's strength and relevance in the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and include a mix of recent studies and classical texts. However, it might be beneficial to include more recent studies or reviews on Marma therapy's clinical applications to provide a more comprehensive view.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the manuscript are suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear and concise, though minor revisions for consistency and flow could enhance readability.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Sandeep Roy
Department, University & Country	Shreeji Medicity Hospital, India