

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_OR_98246</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The beneficial effects of photobiomodulation to reduce intraocular pressure in primary open angle glaucoma.</b>
Type of the 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>1. Yes. Photobiomodulation is an emerging, cost-effective therapy for glaucoma. More such studies are required.</b>  <b>2. Yes.</b>  <b>3. Yes.</b>  <b>4. No. Results and, results and discussion needs to be modified. Study design to be mentioned.</b>  <b>5. No. There is lack of statistical analysis. No tests are mentioned based on which the results are declared as significant.</b>  <b>6. References are sufficient, but, need to be edited as per accepted format.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	1. No. The whole article has multiple grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. It requires a language edit.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The discussion needs to compare the results of the present study with the previously published literature. All the figures and their legends need to be modified, after proper statistical analysis.	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Avinash Mishra</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Military Hospital, India</b>