

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_102974
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Orally administered Dennettia tripetala (Pepper fruit) (Aq) extract on the intraocular pressure and serum concentration of lipid parameters of Wistar strain albino rat
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.journalor.com/index.php/OR/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)
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>	 1. Yes, the manuscript is very important. 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. Yes. <u>Additional suggestions</u> Review the paragraph in the introduction that talks about the studies: "Reports by Tham et al., [3] and Allison et al., [4] stated that it is expected that approximately 76 million people will suffer from glaucoma by 2020... It's already 2023, rephrase paragraph!	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	 1. Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kalinca da Silva Oliveira
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Health Sciences of Porto Alegre (UFCSA), Brazil