

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_100478
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of risk factors for primary open-angle glaucoma: About 100 cases.
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>)

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. This manuscript for scientific community required a proper standard questionnaire required. Health policy maker can imagine level of understanding IQ of public for awareness of this serious silent optic neuropathy which affects quality of life.</p> <p>2. Title is fine.</p> <p>3. Abstract can further precise towards modifiable risk factors which can patients can prevent and non- modifiable risk factors which doctor can follow-up visits according to severity.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript required more focused, what we can achieve after this study new, which implication required in community like SCREEN of Community of this disease before symptoms appear by above factors 3 Or more present in a person.</p> <p>5. Manuscript is scientifically good.</p> <p>6. Read this study link below https://bmcophthalmol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12886-015-0124-x</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	If its first try of write, it's very overall all better, need little refinement.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sadaf Rahman
Department, University & Country	Ruth Pafu Faazia Medical College, PAF Hospital Faisal Base, Pakistan