



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_46209
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSING THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN AYURVEDIC MEDICINE FOR THE WRIST FRACTURE
Type of the Article	Short Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>ii. Line-17-19 Please express scientifically based on the evidence obtained from the study OR highlight the evidence and make a conclusion based on this.</p> <p>iii. Line-23-32 Whole Introduction is only repetition of Abstract. Please rewrite this part scientifically explaining the background, need and significance, Is there any previous study? Or how your study differs from the previous one, Clear objective and methodology obtained etc.</p> <p>iv. Line-34-44 Objective may be explained as Primary objective and Secondary objective rather to write 'General' and 'Specific'</p> <p>v. Line-52 Title may be "Study setting" in place of "Research area"</p> <p>vi. Line-62 Explain the details of statistical method obtained in the study</p> <p>vii. Line-66 Meaning is not clear</p> <p>viii. Line-68-82 There is no Discussion on the obtained Result or Observation of the study. The result does not bring the scientific explanation or clearance that study wanted to express. Author may put some table or Graph for better understanding.</p> <p>ix. Line-83-97 Please conclude the aims and each objective of the study with limitation and Recommendations and its better to avoid quantitative Data in this part which can be explained in Discussion part.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Kindly Check for grammatical errors are frequently observed throughout the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	I appreciate the concept or approach taken by the author/authors on this relevant area to bring out the scientific base of Ayurveda treatment/management but unfortunately the structure of the manuscript is not well expressed scientifically which need to be incorporated. I must thankful to the author/authors for giving me opportunity to read the creation.	

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?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> <p>Ethical Clearance details not provided, as the present Study deals with human hence IEC details should be provided.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Bidhan Mahajon</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>India</i>