

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56908

**Title:** "Vedanadhyaya of Kashyapa Samhita: An Ayurvedic Perspective on Pain and Its Correlation with Contemporary Science" .

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....

Accept after minor revision.....

**Accept after major revision Yes**

Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

| Rating         | Excel. | Good | Fair | Poor |
|----------------|--------|------|------|------|
| Originality    |        | Y    |      |      |
| Techn. Quality |        |      | Y    |      |
| Clarity        |        |      | Y    |      |
| Significance   |        | Y    |      |      |

Reviewer's ID: JPR- Sahil Srivastava

## Detailed Reviewer's Report

### Reviewer Comments

1. Relevance of Topic: The manuscript addresses an important and interdisciplinary topic by attempting to correlate Ayurvedic concepts of Vedana with modern pain science. The theme is appropriate and potentially valuable.
2. Lack of Critical Analysis: The manuscript is predominantly descriptive. It lacks critical evaluation of concepts, limiting its depth and academic impact.
3. Over-Simplified Correlation: The direct mapping of Vataja, Pittaja, and Kaphaja Vedana to modern pain categories appears overly simplistic and lacks sufficient scientific justification. These relationships should be presented as partial or conceptual overlaps rather than direct equivalence.
4. Absence of Research Gap: The introduction does not clearly define a research gap. The manuscript does not establish how it differs from or advances existing integrative literature.
5. Lack of Novel Contribution: No distinct conceptual model, framework, or new insight is proposed. The paper mainly reiterates known information.
6. Methodological Limitations: The review lacks a defined methodology. There is no clarity regarding literature selection, inclusion criteria, or analytical approach.
7. Superficial Interpretation of Figures/Tables: While flowcharts and tables are included, they are not adequately explained or linked to detailed neurophysiological mechanisms such as nociception or central sensitization.
8. Insufficient Scientific Depth: The discussion does not adequately integrate modern neuroscience concepts (e.g., neurotransmitters, pain pathways, modulation mechanisms).
9. Lack of Limitations and Counterarguments: The manuscript does not address discrepancies or limitations in correlating Ayurvedic and modern concepts, which weakens its scientific balance.
10. Language and Framing: Certain statements are presented with undue certainty. Scientific caution is needed, using terms such as "may correlate," "can be interpreted," or "suggests similarity."
11. Clinical Implications Section: The clinical application is mentioned but not sufficiently elaborated with evidence-based or practical examples.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

12. Conclusion:

The conclusion is generalized and does not strongly reflect a unique contribution or key takeaway from the study.

Overall Recommendation: Major revision is required. The manuscript has a good conceptual base but needs significant improvement in analytical depth, methodological clarity, and originality to be suitable for publication.