



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56799

Title: An Explanatory Study of Beneficial Ayurvedic Diet for Health

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revisionYES...

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality				√
Techn. Quality				√
Clarity				√
Significance			√	

Reviewer's ID: JPR-094

Detailed Reviewer's Report

****Reviewer Report****

1. Summary of the Manuscript

The manuscript presents a ****conceptual and explanatory review**** of Ayurvedic dietary principles (Aahar) and their role in maintaining health. It draws heavily from classical texts such as ****Charaka Samhita, Sushruta Samhita, and Ashtanga Hridaya****, and discusses concepts like:

- * Tridosha balance
- * Aahar Vidhi (dietary rules)
- * Satvik, Rajasic, Tamasic diet
- * Role of digestion (Agni)

The study aims to highlight the importance of diet in preventive healthcare.

□ 2. Strengths

REVIEWER'S REPORT

*** ✓ **Strong classical foundation****

Uses authentic Ayurvedic texts and traditional concepts.

*** ✓ **Relevant topic****

Diet and lifestyle diseases are highly relevant in modern healthcare.

*** ✓ **Good literature support****

Includes multiple recent references (2021–2025).

*** ✓ **Holistic approach****

Connects physical, mental, and spiritual health.

3. Weaknesses

Major Weaknesses

*** **Language and font issues****

*** Large portion written in **non-Unicode Hindi (Kruti Dev)** → unreadable internationally**

*** Not acceptable for standard journals**

*** **Lack of originality****

*** Mostly **descriptive and repetitive****

*** No novel hypothesis, model, or findings**

*** **No methodology clarity****

*** “Explanatory study” is vague**

*** No systematic review method, inclusion criteria, or analysis**

*** **No data / results****

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- * Purely theoretical
- * No experimental, clinical, or statistical evidence

* ****Poor structure****

* Missing standard sections:

- * Results
- * Discussion (analytical)
- * Conclusion (focused)

Minor Weaknesses

- * Repetition of Ayurvedic concepts
- * Improper citation formatting
- * Mixed language (Hindi + English)
- * Grammatical and typographical errors

4. Key Points

* Ayurveda considers ****diet (Aahar) as a primary pillar of health****

* Proper diet maintains:

- * Dosha balance
- * Digestive fire (Agni)
- * Classification of diet:

- * Satvik (pure)
- * Rajasic (active)
- * Tamasic (dull)
- * Concept of ****Viruddha Aahar (incompatible diet)**** highlighted
- * Emphasis on ****preventive healthcare****

REVIEWER'S REPORT

5. Significance

* Important for:

* Public health awareness

* Preventive medicine

* Integrative healthcare

* However:

* Scientific impact is ****LOW****

* Lacks ****evidence-based validation****

* Limited contribution beyond existing literature

7. Recommendation

Final Decision: ****MAJOR REVISION REQUIRED****

8. Reviewer Comments (for Author)

To make this paper publishable:

Mandatory Revisions

1. Convert entire manuscript into ****proper English (Unicode text)****

2. Remove ****font encoding issues****

3. Add ****clear methodology**** (e.g., systematic review approach)

4. Include:

* Comparative analysis (Ayurveda vs modern nutrition)

* Tables/figures

5. Reduce ****plagiarism (<15%)****

6. Improve ****grammar and formatting****

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Suggested Improvements

- * Add **clinical or experimental data***
- * Include **modern scientific correlation***
- * Provide **novel insights or model***
- * Strengthen conclusion with **practical implications***

Final Verdict (Simple)

Good topic but **poor execution**

Not ready for publication in current form

Needs **major rewriting and scientific strengthening**

Justification for Major Revision

Title Section

Title: "An Explanatory Study of Beneficial Ayurvedic Diet for Health"

* **Too generic and non-specific***

* **No indication of:**

* **Study design (review/systematic/clinical)**

* **Scope or novelty**

Revision needed: Make it specific and scientific

Abstract Section (Lines 5–32)

Lines 5–10

REVIEWER'S REPORT

* Written in ****non-Unicode Hindi font (Kruti Dev)****

* Not readable internationally

Major formatting issue

Lines 11–18

* No clear ****background-objective-methods-results-conclusion structure****

* Overly descriptive, philosophical statements

Lines 19–24

* General public health statements without citation support

* No data or evidence

Lines 25–31

* No ****clear results or findings****

* Lacks scientific conclusion

Line 32 (Keywords)

* Keywords not in standard format (MeSH/Indexing terms missing)

****Overall Issue:**** Abstract is ****non-scientific and poorly structured****

****Introduction (Lines 37–77)****

Lines 37–45

* Over-explanation of basic Ayurveda concepts

* No ****research gap identified****

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Lines 46–53

- * Repetition of general statements
- * No linkage to modern research

Lines 54–60

- * No citations for claims in several places
- * Conceptual discussion without critical analysis

Lines 61–67

- * Lack of logical flow
- * No clear problem statement

Lines 68–77

- * Classical references used but:
 - * No interpretation
 - * No comparison with modern science

Major Issue:

- * No **novelty**
- * No **research gap**
- * Purely descriptive

Objectives (Lines 78–80)

- * Objective is **too vague**
- * “Explanatory study” not defined scientifically

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Needs:

* Specific, measurable objective

****Methodology (Lines 81–87)****

Critical Issue Section

* **No proper methodology**

* **No:**

* **Inclusion/exclusion criteria**

* **Search strategy**

* **Study design (systematic/narrative review unclear)**

* **Only mentions classical texts → not sufficient for publication**

****Major flaw:****

This alone justifies **MAJOR REVISION**

****Conceptual Sections (Lines 88–157)****

Lines 88–99 (Definition of Aahar)

* **Purely descriptive**

* **No critical analysis**

Lines 100–107 (Classification)

* **Repetitive explanation**

* **No modern scientific correlation**

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Lines 108–127 (Principles)

* Lacks:

* Evidence-based discussion

* Comparative analysis

Lines 128–136

* Statements without supporting references

* No novelty

Lines 137–143

* General nutrition statements (textbooklike)

* No originality

Lines 144–153

* Example (Amla digestion) lacks scientific backing

* No biochemical explanation

Lines 154–157

* Listing concepts without explanation or analysis

****Major Issue:****

Entire section is:

* Descriptive

* Repetitive

* Non-analytical

REVIEWER'S REPORT

**Discussion & Conclusion (Lines 158–178)**

Lines 158–165

- * No structured discussion
- * No comparison with existing studies

Lines 166–170

- * Conceptual statements (Agni, Ojas) without evidence

Lines 171–178

- * Conclusion is:
 - * Very general
 - * Not derived from analysis
 - * No practical implications

****Major Issue:****

- * No scientific discussion
- * No critical evaluation
- * No strong conclusion

**References (Lines 179–215)**

- * Formatting inconsistent
- * Some references:

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

* Not indexed

* Not peer-reviewed

* Heavy reliance on:

* Classical texts

* Secondary review articles

* Missing:

* High-impact journal citations

****Critical Global Issues (Why MAJOR REVISION)****

1. Language & Formatting

* Non-Unicode Hindi → unacceptable internationally

2. Lack of Scientific Methodology

* No defined research design

3. No Original Contribution

* Fully descriptive review

4. No Data / Evidence

* No experimental or analytical content

5. Poor Structure

REVIEWER'S REPORT

* Missing IMRAD format

6. High Risk of Plagiarism

* Similar to many existing Ayurveda reviews

****Final Reviewer Justification****

****Major Revision is required because:****

* The manuscript is ****not in publishable format****

* It lacks:

* Scientific rigor

* Methodology

* Originality

* Extensive corrections are needed in:

* Language

* Structure

* Content

****Final Recommendation****

****Decision: MAJOR REVISION****