**Manuscript evaluation guidelines**Title: Ayurveda Education in India: Who is there to deliver it?  
  
  
1. Importance of the paper  
  
           Does it address issues relevant to the fields of bioethics and medical ethics in the developing countries?

Though it is important to take stock of Ayurveda in India (for historical and policy reasons), this paper does not have any central line of focus, especially with regard to specific questions of ethics or bioethics. Rather, the article is a lament on poor institutional educational structures—but these would hold good across medical and professional education in India. There is no clear original insight I can discern.

2. Is it topical?  
  
           Is the issue discussed from another country's/culture perspective? No  
  
           Will it influence practice or policy? No. Recommendations are too generic.  
  
           Is it too specialized for the journal? Yes. It may fit better in a journal on Ayurveda educational institution.

3. Originality  
  
           Is the information /comment new? No specific insight is offered.

Is there any likelihood of plagiarism? Perhaps not plagiarism, but most of the data seems sourced from easily available public sources.  
  
  
4. Conclusions  
           Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed? : The paper takes on too many issues—too much quantitative data that is not clearly contextualized in terms of policy or knowledge. It is very diagnostic and prescriptive in many directions at the same time.  
  
           Does the article contain loose generalisations? Yes, see above.  
  
           Are there any important omissions? : Yes, need more qualitative engagements. There is a feeling of a deluge of data.

5. Other comments: While I am particularly sympathetic to more articles on Ayurveda (and other credible health systems), this article is not fruitful. Unfortunately poorly written, it borders on a scattered ‘rant’ that is at odds with a suitable academic tone. The case needs to be made to address a needed high-quality Ayurveda medical education, but beyond flaws and lacunae (data or institutional, as these are generic), it would be more useful to pick one strand (policy, epistemology, clinical practice) for sustained reflection, and maybe come up with at least one clear tangible, grounded recommendation.  
  
  
6. Recommendation  
  
 Accept as is  
  
 Accept with modifications (specify)  
  
 - style

- substance  
  
I would Reject this article.  
  
7. Separate comments for the author: None
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