

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Surgery</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_98887
Title of the Manuscript:	Unilateral "Christmas tree" cataract: about a case
Type of the 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.journalajrs.com/index.php/AJRS/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</li> </ol>		
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>In General: it's a good paper and the subject of the manuscript is applicable and useful.  <b>Title:</b> the title properly explains the purpose and objective of the article  <b>Abstract:</b> abstract contains an appropriate summary for the article, the language used in the abstract is easy to read and understand, and there are no suggestions for improvement.  <b>Introduction:</b> authors do provide adequate background on the topic and reason for this article and describe what the authors hoped to achieve.  <b>Results:</b> the results are presented clearly, the authors provide accurate research results, and there is sufficient evidence for each result.  <b>Conclusion:</b> in general: Good and the research provides sample data for the authors to make their conclusion.  <b>Grammar:</b> Need Some revision. <b>(Check The Paper Comments).</b>            Please provide and edit the following information in the Paper  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conflict of Interest.</li> <li>Source of Funding.</li> <li>Some references without DOI (attached file).</li> <li>Writing references according to the terms of the journal (attached file).</li> <li>Reduce the abstract to less than 250 words.</li> <li>Reduce the number of references.</li> <li>The result and discussion must be in one paragraph.</li> </ol>           Finally, this was an attractive article. In its current state, it adds much new insightful information to the field. Therefore, I accept that paper to be published in your journal.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mohammed Nader Shalaby</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Suez Canal University, Egypt</b>