

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_101826
Title of the Manuscript:	Preserving conjunctiva, the 'real estate' of glaucoma surgeons
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 <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>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1) The paper presented proved useful. Publishing the manuscript will definitely research scholars researching on the topic. I recommend this paper for publication and privileged to review the paper. We hope to receive further research on the data analysis done</p> <p>2) The title of the article corresponds to the content of the manuscript.</p> <p><b>3) The abstract is exhaustive.</b></p> <p>4) The subsections and the structure of the manuscript are compiled correctly.</p> <p>5) I consider the manuscript to be scientifically correct.</p> <p><b>6) The links are fresh and sufficient.</b></p> <p>I recommend studying the mechanism of action of light therapy with the Bioptron device and its use in all clinical cases of this pathology, even in the presence of oncology</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The quality of the article in English is suitable for scientific communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bitsoev Vladimir Dodyevich</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Podolsk Regional Clinical Hospital, Russia</b>