

PEER REVIEWER GUIDELINES

International Journal of Ayurveda

Published by Dr. Kembhavi's Astanga Wellness Private Limited

Hubli, Karnataka, India

Website: internationaljournalofayurveda.org

Email: editor@internationaljournalofayurveda.org

Document Version: 1.0

Effective Date: September 2025

Review Date: September 2026

WELCOME TO PEER REVIEWERS

Thank you for contributing your expertise to the International Journal of Ayurveda. As a peer reviewer, you play a crucial role in maintaining the quality and integrity of scientific literature in traditional medicine. These guidelines will help you provide constructive, thorough, and timely reviews that enhance the manuscript quality and support author development.

Journal Mission

To advance traditional medicine through rigorous scientific research while bridging ancient Ayurvedic wisdom with modern research methodologies.

Reviewer Importance

Your expert evaluation ensures that published research meets the highest standards of scientific rigor, methodological soundness, and contribution to Ayurvedic knowledge.

REVIEWER SELECTION AND INVITATION

Reviewer Qualifications

Academic Requirements

- Advanced degree** (PhD, MD, BAMS, or equivalent) in relevant field
- Minimum 5 years** research or clinical experience in Ayurveda or related areas
- Publication record** in peer-reviewed journals
- Subject matter expertise** in manuscript topic area

- **Language proficiency** sufficient for detailed manuscript evaluation

Professional Standing

- **Active research** or clinical practice in traditional medicine
- **Institutional affiliation** with recognized academic or clinical organization
- **Professional reputation** for expertise and integrity
- **Previous review experience** preferred but not required
- **Commitment to ethical standards** in research and publication

Invitation Process

How Reviewers Are Selected

- **Editorial board recommendations** based on expertise areas
- **Author suggestions** (carefully screened for conflicts)
- **Database searches** of published researchers in relevant fields
- **Professional network** referrals from trusted colleagues
- **Previous reviewer performance** and availability

Invitation Response

- **Respond within 48 hours** to review invitations
- **Accept only if qualified** and available to meet deadlines
- **Decline promptly** if unable to provide quality review
- **Suggest alternative reviewers** when declining
- **Communicate constraints** honestly regarding timeline or expertise

REVIEW TIMELINE AND EXPECTATIONS

Standard Timeline

- **Initial response:** 48 hours to accept/decline invitation
- **Review completion:** 4 weeks from acceptance
- **Extension requests:** Contact editorial office immediately if needed
- **Emergency reviews:** Expedited timeline when requested
- **Quality over speed:** Thorough review preferred over rushed evaluation

Time Investment

- **Initial assessment:** 1-2 hours for preliminary evaluation
- **Detailed review:** 4-8 hours for comprehensive analysis
- **Report writing:** 2-4 hours for constructive feedback
- **Total commitment:** 6-12 hours depending on manuscript complexity
- **Follow-up:** Additional time for revised manuscript review if needed

Review Frequency

- **Annual commitment:** 6-12 manuscripts per year (negotiable)
 - **Balanced workload:** Distribute requests across reviewers
 - **Specialty focus:** Reviews primarily in your expertise areas
 - **Development opportunity:** Occasional reviews in adjacent fields
 - **Recognition:** Acknowledgment for significant contributions
-

CONFIDENTIALITY AND ETHICS

Confidentiality Requirements

Manuscript Confidentiality

- **Privileged information:** Treat manuscript as confidential communication
- **No sharing:** Do not discuss content with colleagues without permission
- **Secure handling:** Store and access manuscripts securely
- **Complete confidentiality:** Maintain confidentiality even after review completion
- **Digital security:** Use secure networks and devices for review

Data Protection

- **Research data:** Treat all data as confidential
- **Patient information:** Extra protection for clinical data
- **Proprietary methods:** Respect intellectual property
- **Unpublished findings:** No use in your own research
- **Traditional knowledge:** Appropriate respect for indigenous knowledge

Ethical Standards

Unbiased Evaluation

- **Objective assessment:** Base judgments on scientific merit only
- **Cultural sensitivity:** Respect diverse research approaches
- **Fair evaluation:** No bias based on author characteristics
- **Evidence-based:** Support all criticisms with specific evidence
- **Professional tone:** Constructive and respectful communication

Conflict of Interest Management

- **Immediate disclosure:** Report any potential conflicts
 - **Professional relationships:** Declare connections with authors
 - **Financial interests:** Disclose relevant financial relationships
 - **Competitive research:** Identify competing or collaborative research
 - **Personal relationships:** Report family or close personal connections
-

REVIEW PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

Double-Blind Review Process

Anonymity Maintenance

- **Author identity:** Unknown to reviewers during evaluation
- **Reviewer identity:** Unknown to authors during review
- **Editorial coordination:** Editor manages all communications
- **Identity protection:** Avoid identifying yourself in review comments
- **Post-review revelation:** Identity may be revealed with mutual consent

System Navigation

- **Online platform:** Use designated review system (when available)
- **Email submissions:** Current process via secure email
- **Document handling:** Download and review manuscripts securely
- **Report submission:** Submit reviews through designated channels
- **Technical support:** Contact editorial office for system issues

Review Structure and Components

Initial Assessment (Week 1)

- **Scope evaluation:** Fit with journal mission and scope
- **Basic quality:** Fundamental scientific soundness
- **Ethical compliance:** Research ethics and integrity
- **Preliminary decision:** Continue with detailed review or recommend rejection
- **Timeline confirmation:** Verify ability to complete review on time

Detailed Evaluation (Weeks 2-3)

- **Methodology assessment:** Research design appropriateness
- **Data analysis:** Statistical methods and interpretation
- **Literature review:** Completeness and accuracy of citations
- **Contribution assessment:** Significance and novelty
- **Presentation quality:** Clarity, organization, and writing

Report Preparation (Week 4)

- **Summary writing:** Overall assessment and recommendation
- **Detailed comments:** Specific feedback for improvement
- **Priority ranking:** Major vs. minor issues identification
- **Constructive suggestions:** Specific improvement recommendations
- **Final recommendation:** Clear accept/revise/reject decision

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Scientific Merit Assessment

Research Question and Objectives

- **Clarity:** Are research questions clearly stated?
- **Significance:** Is the research question important to the field?
- **Originality:** Does the study address novel aspects?
- **Feasibility:** Are objectives achievable with proposed methods?
- **Relevance:** How does this contribute to Ayurvedic knowledge?

Literature Review

- **Comprehensiveness:** Adequate coverage of relevant literature
- **Currency:** Recent and relevant citations included
- **Critical analysis:** Thoughtful evaluation of previous work
- **Gap identification:** Clear justification for current study
- **Classical integration:** Appropriate use of traditional texts

Methodology

- **Design appropriateness:** Suitable for research questions
- **Sample size:** Adequate for meaningful conclusions
- **Control measures:** Appropriate controls and comparisons
- **Bias minimization:** Strategies to reduce systematic errors
- **Ethical compliance:** Proper ethical approvals and procedures

Traditional Medicine Specific Criteria

- **Cultural sensitivity:** Respectful treatment of traditional knowledge
- **Classical accuracy:** Correct interpretation of traditional texts
- **Standardization:** Appropriate preparation and quality control
- **Integration approach:** Meaningful connection with modern science
- **Community engagement:** Appropriate involvement when applicable

Data Quality and Analysis

Data Collection

- **Methodology rigor:** Systematic and appropriate data collection
- **Instrument validity:** Reliable and validated measurement tools
- **Completeness:** Adequate data for stated objectives
- **Quality control:** Evidence of data verification procedures
- **Missing data:** Appropriate handling of incomplete information

Statistical Analysis

- **Method appropriateness:** Suitable statistical approaches
- **Assumption verification:** Proper statistical assumptions checked
- **Effect size reporting:** Clinical and statistical significance
- **Confidence intervals:** Appropriate uncertainty quantification
- **Multiple testing:** Proper adjustment when applicable

Results Presentation

- **Clarity:** Clear and logical presentation of findings
- **Completeness:** All planned analyses reported
- **Accuracy:** Consistent data across text, tables, and figures
- **Visual aids:** Effective use of tables and figures
- **Honest reporting:** Balanced presentation including limitations

Discussion and Interpretation

Interpretation Quality

- **Accuracy:** Conclusions supported by presented data
- **Context:** Appropriate comparison with existing literature
- **Mechanism exploration:** Thoughtful discussion of underlying processes
- **Clinical relevance:** Practical implications clearly stated
- **Limitations acknowledgment:** Honest assessment of study constraints

Traditional Medicine Integration

- **Classical correlation:** Connection with traditional principles
 - **Modern validation:** How findings relate to contemporary evidence
 - **Mechanistic insights:** Understanding of traditional practices
 - **Safety considerations:** Appropriate discussion of risks and benefits
 - **Cultural implications:** Impact on traditional medicine communities
-

REVIEW REPORT STRUCTURE

Summary Section

Overview Statement (2-3 sentences)

- **Brief description** of study purpose and methods
- **Key findings** summary
- **Overall assessment** of manuscript quality

Significance Assessment (2-3 sentences)

- **Contribution to field** evaluation
- **Novel aspects** identification
- **Potential impact** on traditional medicine practice or research

Recommendation Summary (1 sentence)

- **Clear recommendation:** Accept, Minor Revision, Major Revision, or Reject
- **Primary rationale** for recommendation

Strengths Section

Major Strengths (3-5 points)

- **Methodological strengths** and innovative approaches
- **Significant findings** and important contributions
- **Quality aspects** of data and analysis
- **Clear presentation** and effective communication
- **Traditional medicine integration** when appropriate

Concerns and Limitations Section

Major Concerns (Priority ranking)

- **Methodological issues** requiring attention
- **Analytical problems** or interpretation errors
- **Missing information** or inadequate reporting
- **Ethical concerns** or compliance issues
- **Presentation problems** affecting clarity

Minor Issues

- **Formatting concerns** and style issues
- **Reference problems** or citation errors
- **Figure/table improvements** needed
- **Language issues** requiring attention
- **Technical corrections** for accuracy

Specific Comments Section

Detailed Feedback (Page/line references)

- **Specific location** of each comment
- **Clear description** of issue or suggestion
- **Constructive recommendation** for improvement
- **Rationale** for suggested changes
- **Priority level** (major vs. minor) indication

Comment Categories

- **Scientific accuracy:** Factual corrections needed
- **Methodological clarity:** Procedural explanations required
- **Data interpretation:** Analysis or conclusion issues
- **Literature integration:** Citation or context improvements
- **Presentation enhancement:** Clarity or organization improvements

Questions for Authors

Clarification Requests

- **Methodological details** requiring explanation
- **Data interpretation** questions
- **Missing information** that should be included
- **Rationale requests** for specific choices
- **Technical specifications** needing clarification

Recommendation Section

Overall Recommendation

- **Accept:** Publication ready with minimal changes
- **Minor Revision:** Small improvements needed, no re-review required
- **Major Revision:** Significant changes needed, re-review required
- **Reject:** Fundamental flaws precluding publication

Revision Timeline (if applicable)

- **Minor revisions:** 2-4 weeks recommended
- **Major revisions:** 6-8 weeks recommended
- **Extension considerations:** Complex issues may need longer
- **Re-review expectations:** Your availability for re-review

REVIEW REPORT TEMPLATES

Template 1: Research Article Review

REVIEW REPORT

Manuscript Title: [Title]
Manuscript ID: [ID if available]
Review Date: [Date]

SUMMARY:

This study [brief description of purpose and methods]. The authors [key findings]. Overall, this manuscript [general assessment].

SIGNIFICANCE:

This research [contribution assessment]. The findings [impact evaluation]. [Recommendation rationale].

RECOMMENDATION: [Accept/Minor Revision/Major Revision/Reject]

STRENGTHS:

1. [Strength 1 with explanation]
2. [Strength 2 with explanation]
3. [Strength 3 with explanation]

MAJOR CONCERNS:

1. [Concern 1 with specific details and suggestions]
2. [Concern 2 with specific details and suggestions]
3. [Concern 3 with specific details and suggestions]

MINOR ISSUES:

1. [Issue 1 with location reference]
2. [Issue 2 with location reference]
3. [Issue 3 with location reference]

SPECIFIC COMMENTS:

[Page/Line references with detailed feedback]

QUESTIONS FOR AUTHORS:

1. [Question 1]
2. [Question 2]
3. [Question 3]

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

[Any additional feedback not covered above]

Template 2: Case Study Review

CASE STUDY REVIEW REPORT

SUMMARY:

This case report describes [case description]. The authors present [intervention/outcome]. The case [educational value assessment].

CLINICAL SIGNIFICANCE:

This case [clinical relevance]. The presentation [uniqueness/importance]. [Learning value].

RECOMMENDATION: [Accept/Minor Revision/Major Revision/Reject]

CASE PRESENTATION QUALITY:

- Clinical history completeness
- Diagnostic process clarity
- Treatment description adequacy
- Outcome documentation quality
- Follow-up information sufficiency

EDUCATIONAL VALUE:

- Novel aspects of case
- Teaching points identification
- Clinical practice implications
- Literature integration quality
- Generalizability assessment

CONCERNS:

[Specific issues with case presentation or analysis]

SUGGESTIONS:

[Specific recommendations for improvement]

Template 3: Review Article Assessment

REVIEW ARTICLE EVALUATION

SCOPE AND FOCUS:

The review addresses [topic scope]. The focus [appropriateness assessment]. Coverage [comprehensiveness evaluation].

LITERATURE SEARCH:

Search strategy [adequacy assessment]. Sources [diversity and quality].
Currency [recent literature inclusion].

CRITICAL ANALYSIS:

Synthesis quality [evaluation]. Critical evaluation [depth assessment].
Bias consideration [objectivity].

ORGANIZATION:

Structure [logical flow]. Presentation [clarity assessment]. Conclusions
[support by evidence].

CONTRIBUTION:

Novel insights [identification]. Practice implications [relevance]. Future
directions [appropriateness].

RECOMMENDATION: [Accept/Minor Revision/Major Revision/Reject]

DETAILED FEEDBACK:

[Specific comments on each section]

QUALITY STANDARDS FOR REVIEWS

Excellent Review Characteristics

Thoroughness

- **Comprehensive evaluation** of all manuscript aspects
- **Detailed analysis** of methodology and interpretation
- **Specific feedback** with clear examples and suggestions
- **Balanced assessment** of strengths and weaknesses
- **Constructive recommendations** for improvement

Constructiveness

- **Helpful suggestions** for addressing identified issues
- **Specific guidance** rather than general criticism
- **Positive reinforcement** for strong aspects
- **Educational tone** supporting author development
- **Actionable recommendations** that authors can implement

Professionalism

- **Respectful language** throughout the review
- **Objective evaluation** based on scientific merit
- **Cultural sensitivity** in comments and suggestions
- **Appropriate tone** that encourages rather than discourages
- **Professional courtesy** in all communications

Review Quality Indicators

Technical Excellence

- **Accurate assessment** of methodology and analysis
- **Appropriate expertise** demonstrated in comments
- **Statistical competence** in quantitative evaluation
- **Literature knowledge** evident in context evaluation
- **Traditional medicine understanding** when relevant

Communication Effectiveness

- **Clear writing** that authors can easily understand
 - **Logical organization** of comments and suggestions
 - **Specific references** to manuscript sections and lines
 - **Priority indication** for different types of issues
 - **Actionable feedback** that guides improvement
-

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Traditional Medicine Research

Cultural Sensitivity Requirements

- **Respectful language** when discussing traditional practices
- **Appropriate context** for traditional knowledge evaluation
- **Cultural competence** in assessment of community-based research
- **Indigenous rights** consideration in research evaluation
- **Collaboration approach** rather than extraction mentality

Classical Text Integration

- **Accuracy verification** of Sanskrit terms and translations
- **Contextual appropriateness** of classical references
- **Interpretation quality** of traditional concepts
- **Modern integration** approach evaluation
- **Scholarly rigor** in traditional text usage

International Submissions

Language Considerations

- **Content over language:** Focus on scientific merit over perfect English
- **Cultural context:** Understand different research traditions
- **Translation quality:** Assess meaning clarity despite language issues
- **Constructive language feedback:** Helpful suggestions for improvement
- **Editorial support:** Recommend language editing when beneficial

Methodological Diversity

- **Cultural appropriateness:** Respect for different research approaches

- **Local context:** Understanding of regional research constraints
- **Resource considerations:** Acknowledge different institutional capabilities
- **Collaborative spirit:** Encourage international research cooperation
- **Global perspective:** Value diverse contributions to field knowledge

Emerging Researchers

Mentorship Approach

- **Educational feedback:** Teach through review comments
- **Encouraging tone:** Support early-career development
- **Specific guidance:** Detailed suggestions for improvement
- **Resource recommendations:** Suggest helpful references or methods
- **Professional development:** Comments that enhance research skills

Skill Development Focus

- **Methodology teaching:** Explain better approaches when suggesting changes
- **Writing improvement:** Specific suggestions for clearer communication
- **Literature integration:** Guidance on comprehensive literature review
- **Critical thinking:** Questions that promote deeper analysis
- **Professional standards:** Introduction to field expectations

REVIEWER RECOGNITION AND DEVELOPMENT

Recognition Programs

Annual Recognition

- **Outstanding reviewer awards** for exceptional contributions
- **Public acknowledgment** in journal or website
- **Certificate of appreciation** for significant service
- **Conference recognition** at professional meetings
- **Editorial board invitation** for exemplary reviewers

Professional Benefits

- **CV enhancement** through reviewer service documentation
- **Network expansion** through editorial board connections
- **Skill development** in critical evaluation and scientific writing
- **Early access** to cutting-edge research in the field
- **Professional reputation** building in academic community

Reviewer Development

Training Opportunities

- **Review workshops** and training sessions
- **Best practice guides** and resource materials
- **Mentorship programs** pairing new with experienced reviewers
- **Feedback sessions** on review quality and effectiveness
- **Professional development** support for review skill enhancement

Continuous Improvement

- **Regular feedback** on review quality from editors
- **Performance monitoring** and improvement suggestions
- **Update training** on new standards and expectations
- **Peer learning** opportunities with other reviewers
- **Resource access** to improve review effectiveness

REVIEWER FEEDBACK AND EVALUATION

Editor Feedback to Reviewers

Review Quality Assessment

- **Timeliness evaluation** and improvement suggestions
- **Thoroughness assessment** and enhancement recommendations
- **Constructiveness review** and tone improvement guidance
- **Accuracy verification** and expertise confirmation
- **Overall contribution** evaluation and recognition

Performance Improvement

- **Specific suggestions** for review enhancement
- **Training recommendations** for skill development
- **Resource provision** for improvement support
- **Mentorship connections** with experienced reviewers
- **Regular communication** about expectations and standards

Reviewer Input to Journal

Process Improvement Suggestions

- **System functionality** feedback and improvement ideas
- **Timeline adjustment** recommendations based on experience
- **Guideline clarification** requests and suggestions
- **Training need** identification and resource requests
- **Quality enhancement** ideas for review process improvement

Editorial Policy Input

- **Standard modification** suggestions based on field evolution

- **Criteria adjustment** recommendations for changing research landscape
 - **Best practice** sharing from other journal experiences
 - **Innovation suggestions** for review process enhancement
 - **Field development** insights for journal strategic planning
-

CONTACT AND SUPPORT

Editorial Office Contact

Review Questions

Email: editor@internationaljournalofayurveda.org

Subject: "Reviewer Question - [Specific Topic]"

Response Time: Within 24 hours for urgent review questions

Technical Support

Email: editor@internationaljournalofayurveda.org

Subject: "Technical Support - [Issue Description]"

Response Time: Within 24 hours for technical issues

Training and Development

Email: editor@internationaljournalofayurveda.org

Subject: "Reviewer Development - [Request Type]"

Response Time: Within 48 hours for development requests

Emergency Contacts

Urgent Review Issues

- **Conflict of interest** discovery during review
 - **Ethical concerns** about research conduct
 - **Technical problems** preventing review completion
 - **Timeline issues** requiring immediate attention
 - **Quality concerns** about manuscript or process
-

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Review Checklist

Pre-Review Checklist

- ☐ Confirmed expertise in manuscript topic area

- ☐ Verified no conflicts of interest exist
- ☐ Established secure review environment
- ☐ Confirmed timeline availability
- ☐ Understood confidentiality requirements

During Review Checklist

- ☐ Evaluated research question clarity and significance
- ☐ Assessed methodology appropriateness and rigor
- ☐ Reviewed data quality and analysis accuracy
- ☐ Examined literature integration and context
- ☐ Checked ethical compliance and cultural sensitivity
- ☐ Assessed presentation clarity and organization
- ☐ Prepared constructive and specific feedback
- ☐ Formulated clear recommendation with rationale

Post-Review Checklist

- ☐ Reviewed report for clarity and completeness
- ☐ Verified all major issues addressed
- ☐ Confirmed professional and respectful tone
- ☐ Checked specific references and citations
- ☐ Submitted review within deadline
- ☐ Maintained confidentiality of manuscript content

Appendix B: Common Review Mistakes to Avoid

Content Issues

- **Superficial evaluation** without detailed analysis
- **Personal bias** affecting objective assessment
- **Inappropriate tone** that discourages authors
- **Unclear feedback** that doesn't guide improvement
- **Missing major issues** while focusing on minor problems

Process Issues

- **Late submission** without prior communication
- **Conflict of interest** failure to disclose
- **Confidentiality breach** through inappropriate sharing
- **Inadequate expertise** for manuscript topic
- **Poor communication** with editorial office

Appendix C: Resources for Reviewers

Scientific Writing Resources

- ICMJE Guidelines for manuscript preparation and submission
- CONSORT Statement for randomized trial reporting
- STROBE Guidelines for observational study reporting

- CARE Guidelines for case report writing
- Traditional medicine research methodology guides

Statistical Resources

- Statistical analysis software recommendations
- Power analysis and sample size calculation tools
- Statistical reporting guideline resources
- Consultation services for complex analyses
- Training materials for statistical review

Thank you for your commitment to advancing traditional medicine research through rigorous peer review. Your expertise and dedication ensure that the International Journal of Ayurveda maintains the highest standards of scientific excellence while supporting the global traditional medicine research community.

© 2025 Dr. Kembhavi's Astanga Wellness Private Limited
Confidential Document - For Authorized Reviewers Only