

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Ophthalmology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRROP_95768
Title of the Manuscript:	A study on Preoperative xylocaine sensitivity test in patients undergoing ocular surgeries
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>In General: it's a good paper and the subject of the manuscript is applicable and useful. Title: the title properly explains the purpose and objective of the article Abstract: 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. Introduction: authors do provide adequate background on the topic and reason for this article and describe what the authors hoped to achieve. Results: the results are presented clearly, the authors provide accurate research results, and there is sufficient evidence for each result. Conclusion: in general: Good and the research provides sample data for the authors to make their conclusion. Grammar: Need Some revision. (Check The Paper Comments). Please provide and edit the following information in the Paper</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Conflict of Interest. Source of Funding. Some references without DOI (attached file). Writing references according to the terms of the journal (attached file). Reduce the abstract to less than 250 words. Reduce the number of references. The result and discussion must be in one paragraph. <p>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>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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed Nader Shalaby
Department, University & Country	Suez Canal University, Egypt