

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58329

Title: *A Case Study on Ayurvedic Management of Sirajaal with Special Reference to Scleritis*

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
 ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study:

- The study addresses a clinically important ophthalmic condition with Ayurvedic relevance
- The case is presented in a clear and logical sequence
- Clinical findings and treatment protocol are adequately described
- Before and after clinical photographs support the reported improvement
- The discussion correlates Ayurvedic principles with modern concepts
- The conclusion is consistent with the observed clinical outcome
- The study has educational value for Ayurvedic ophthalmology practitioners

Weakness of the study:

- The report is based on a single case with limited generalizability
- Long term follow up is not available
- Ethical approval and patient consent should be stated more clearly
- Objective outcome measures could be included for stronger evidence
- Minor grammatical and formatting errors require correction
- The discussion could compare findings with more published studies
- Limitations of the case report should be discussed in greater detail

Reviewers Comments:

The manuscript presents an interesting case of Sirajaal correlated with scleritis and demonstrates the potential role of Ayurvedic Kriyakalpa procedures in symptom management. The case history, clinical examination, treatment protocol, and outcome are presented in a simple and organized manner. The inclusion of before and after clinical photographs strengthens the presentation of the results. The manuscript is generally easy to understand, although several grammatical, spelling, and formatting errors should be corrected to improve readability. The authors should clearly mention institutional ethical approval or state if it was exempt, and written informed consent for publication of the patient's clinical details and photographs should also be included. Since this is a single case report, the limitations and lack of long term follow up should be discussed more clearly. Additional comparison with similar published studies would further strengthen the discussion. Overall, the manuscript is informative and suitable for publication after minor revision.

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to describe an original clinical case, and no obvious evidence of previous publication or duplicated content was identified during this review. No apparent plagiarism concerns were observed. However, a routine plagiarism similarity check should be performed by the journal before publication to confirm originality and ensure compliance with publication ethics.