

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	Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	This article can boost the knowledge about secondary glaucoma among medical students/practitioners and community. Secondary glaucoma can lost the vision of the patients without any secondary symptoms, so its important article to focus on this topic.	Secondary glaucomas are progressive disease causing severe visual impairment – even blindness, as it is usually missed out in the initial examination. Hence our study is quite informative and helps in early detection and treatment of the disease.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Yes it is a self explanatory title
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.	It's comprehensive but author should not use the abbreviation in the abstract section, so kindly remove the abbreviation.	It is comprehensive and briefs all important points.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	Yes it is in standard format.
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.	Few changes are required: 1. Methodology should be structured and also mention the significance values, statistical analysis. 2. Abbreviation should mention after conclusion 3. You can make a flowchart for methodology	Scientifically it is a good source of information about secondary glaucomas
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	It was pretty sufficient and good enough for this study.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Yes	Yes it is pretty simple to understand.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> 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 , informed and written consent was taken from the patients in the study.