

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_96442
Title of the Manuscript:	Intracorneal glass foreign body in a case of spectacle glass injury
Type of the Article	Case report

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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. 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)	Yes Yes, kindly change it: Intrastromal Corneal glass foreign body in spectacle injury No.. rewrite the abstract, it should summarise the whole case, the presentation and management. It should be a single paragraph. Some sentences are picked from the introduction. Kindly avoid that Was a bandage contact lens placed? Intraocular pressure need not be measured in a possible open globe injury, kindly remove that sentence Avoid repetition (Glass is optically clear- this sentence has recurred thrice)	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes Justify the document, it does not look neat. (ctrl+J)	
Optional/General comments	None	

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:	Madhurima A Nayak
Department, University & Country	Father Muller Medical College, India