

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_125515
Title of the Manuscript:	A CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY OF CAUSES OF SECONDARY GLAUCOMAS AT A TERTIARY EYE CARE CENTRE
Type of the Article	Original research article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	SEE ATTACHMENT	Pros of this study is it is clinically informative as its briefs the different causes of secondary glaucomas , which will throw light on further studies, where as the cons are it is done in small sample and complete evaluation and prognosis of the disease are not included.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		This title is suitable as it gives the brief idea of our study and also its pretty simple.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		Yes the abstract in our study is concised, brief and informative.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		We think its pretty correct , as we followed the standard journals.
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		Yes it is a scientifically robust study, since there is paucity in the research work of secondary glaucoma, our study would be informative and clinically relevant for further studies.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		The number of references are not sufficient enough, although the resources for secondary glaucoma studies are few which are conducted in the past 10 years.
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		Yes the language used here is quite simple.
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No ethical issues were faced during the study as it was conducted after taking informed and written consent of the patient.