Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_82363**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Frequency of refractive errors in school age children: A cross sectional study**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	The idea for the study is good and very interesting. However, I have some comments and suggestions: **In title:** it is better to replace the word 'frequency' with 'magnitude or prevalence' **in the Abstract:** Please add background section at the beginning of the abstract Put the study design, place and duration under methodology section The result part of the Abstract is not clearly written Grammatical error, punctuation, typos etc of the Ms need to be corrected/improved The rationale/significance of the study need to be well justified **Method:** • Remove non standard abbreviations like '&' from the MS • **P =** 4.27% ≅ 4%, *n* = 369 ≅ 400: What is the need of approximation if you have no justification? Of course, increasing the sample size increase the representativeness of the sample but approximating 369 into 400 is not logical and justifiable. Otherwise, you could add non response rate (5-10%) to the calculated sample size (369) rather than approximation. • The selected statistical analysis method is weak and not appropriate **Result** • Needs well-articulated rephrasing of the language • The age distribution in Table 2 needs to be put in category. What you put is just year like 6, 7 etc. But it does not mean all these students are perfectly at the same age. At least, they differ in days, weeks, or months of age despite the same years of age. In addition, the percentage of children of the respective frequency have to be mentioned • It would be smarter if you did association showing the factors related with refractive error in the result. • In the methodology part, chi-square test was used to show the impact of variables on outcome variables? But I have not seen any Chi-square test or other statistical test done in the result of your Ms **Discussion** • Please use consistent citation style in the introduction and discussion part, which conform with the journal • In the discussion part of the MS, paragraph 2 is all about your study findings but you cited references. What is the need of these citations???? • "The results of our study showed association of refractive error with gender"—Where did you show this association in your result???? Not mentioned at all and so how are you going to discuss as your finding???? • The discussion part is too short and need more explanatory discussion	
Minor REVISION comments	Please put the heading and subheading appropriately by following the standard MS writing guideline of the journal What is the significance of stratifying children and other variables as government vs private school? Needs justification or remove it. • Rewrite the tables in very well-organized manner. The current tables need modification before publication (if accepted to be published)	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	This article generally needs well organized standardized rewriting of the MS with very good English language articulation if it is going to be published.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Endeshaw Chekol Abebe**
Department, University & Country	**Debre Tabor University, Ethiopia**