

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_95245
Title of the Manuscript:	Orbital cellulitis revealing neglected intraocular foreign bodies: about 58 cases
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalor.com/index.php/OR/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>1 As far as my knowledge goes , I think it is very important for pathology diagnosis.</p> <p>2 I think it is suitable.</p> <p>3. Although abstract is comprehensive, it has a confusing structure. Please revise the structure as proposed (Background, Patients and methods, Results, Discussion and Conclusions)</p> <p>4. Yes, it is.</p> <p>5. Yes, it is.</p> <p>6. The references are insufficient and outdated, as with a quick search for the subject of the article you can find about 10 references between 2000 and 2010 and much more for the decade 2010-2020. The manuscript has only one reference of 2013</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes it is.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please try to use Purpose or Scope instead of Goal.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aristeidis Chandrinos
Department, University & Country	University of West Attica, Greece