

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55037

**Title:** "Laughter Yoga as a Mind–Body Intervention: Exploring Its Impact on Psychological Well-Being"

### 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. Anam Zehra**

### Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

This manuscript presents a narrative/systematic review of empirical and theoretical work on Laughter Yoga, synthesising approximately twenty-five studies on its psychological and physiological benefits across diverse populations. The article is well organised (abstract–introduction–literature review–methodology–results–discussion–conclusion) and offers a clear overview of Laughter Yoga as a mind–body intervention linked to positive psychology and stress reduction. However, the review procedures need to be described with greater rigour (databases, time frame, search strings, and quality appraisal), the claim of “systematic review” should be better justified, and some tables, references, and sentences require careful language and formatting edits.

**Recommendation:** Accept after minor revision.

## Detailed Reviewer's Report

### STRENGTHS

1. The manuscript addresses a timely and relevant topic by analysing the role of Laughter Yoga in enhancing psychological well-being and reducing stress through mind–body mechanisms.
2. The literature review covers diverse populations and contexts, presenting psychological, social, and physiological outcomes in a coherent, structured manner.
3. The methodology section states the aim, objectives, inclusion criteria, and basic search strategy, which gives clarity about how studies were identified.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

**Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP**

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## **REVIEWER'S REPORT**

4. The results are summarised in a well-organised table that highlights key studies and major findings, making the review useful for practitioners and researchers.
5. The manuscript includes a clear limitations section and meaningful suggestions for future research and application in educational, clinical, and community settings.

## **WEAKNESSES**

1. The claim of conducting a systematic review is not fully supported due to limited methodological details such as specific databases, search dates, and structured screening procedures.
2. The search strategy is described in general terms; it requires more precision about search strings, time frames, and step-wise selection of articles to ensure transparency.
3. The table of reviewed studies is selective and needs standardisation in formatting, consistency of author details, spacing, and journal information.
4. The discussion is mostly descriptive and would benefit from more critical examination, comparison of findings, and deeper analysis of inconsistencies or boundary conditions.
5. Minor language issues, formatting inconsistencies, and reference-section errors need correction to meet journal standards.