

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_95407
Title of the Manuscript:	Case Reports: Primary congenital glaucoma in mother and her son
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.journalajcrs.com/index.php/AJCRS/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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>Yes. There are many concepts that are still unclear when it comes to congenital glaucomas. Hence this article can be beneficial</p> <p>No. Title can be changed as 'study of congenital glaucoma in a mother and child. Or can be 'role of heredity factors in understanding congenital glaucoma-a case report</p> <p>Yes.it is comprehensive</p> <p>Yes. It is appropriate</p> <p>Yes. It is scientifically correct</p> <p>Yes.it is sufficient</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. The language use is appropriate but some words such as 'hope to' could be avoided	
Optional/General comments	While explaining case 2, it is given that 'he is having a normal mind" , it can be changed as the physical and mental milestones were normal/ his intelligence quotient(iq) was good etc. Mind normal is vague description	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Spoorthy S
Department, University & Country	Sapthagiri Institute of Medical Sciences and Research Centre, India