

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_98278
Title of the Manuscript:	RECURRENT MALIGNANT MELANOMA EYELID A CASE REPORT AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Type of the Article	Case study

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.journalirjo.com/index.php/IRJO/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) Okay</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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript could have been more concise on the topic taken. Many a times it is deviating from the initial abstract given. Authors could have mentioned the status of the other eye's vision.</p> <p>Okay</p> <p>Needs little revision</p> <p>Needs more revision</p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p>Seems adequate</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Can be revised better	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The current status of vision is not stated</p> <p>2. What about globule preservation here?</p> <p>3. The immediate cosmesis post RT is not discusse</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:	Surega A
Department, University & Country	Tamilnadu Government Multi Super Speciality Hospital, India