

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Ophthalmology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRROP_99106
Title of the Manuscript:	Secondary glaucoma after congenital cataract surgery: a serious complication not to be missed(A case report)
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.journalajrop.com/index.php/AJRROP/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>REVIEW</p> <p>The topic is interesting as childhood blindness remains a global issue. In some settings, congenital cataract is rare and its management not easy. So this case report enlightens the long term complications.</p> <p>Anyhow, some ameliorations are needed before publication. Here are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract A case report must be structured as follows: Introduction, Observation, Conclusion. The two paragraphs mentioned are not useful 2. Introduction Two paragraphs can be deleted 3. Clinical case The reader needs more details about the case (see manuscript) 4. Discussion We lack differential diagnosis as this could be a congenital dysgenesis case (microphthalmia, cataract, glaucoma...); as far as congenital cataract is a key word, that must appear in the discussion 5. Conclusion Is not relevant 6. References The authors could have added some studies on congenital cataract and its management 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mme Assumpta Lucienne Bella
Department, University & Country	University of Yaounde 1, Cameroon