

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_98246
Title of the Manuscript:	The beneficial effects of photobiomodulation to reduce intraocular pressure in primary open angle glaucoma.
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>
--	--------------------	--

Review Form 1.7

<p><u>Compulsory REVISION</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, it is .</p> <p>Yes, it is suitable</p> <p>Yes, it is comprehensive</p> <p>Some are needed to correct .1 methodology of selecting threatened case or placebo 2 please explain inclusion criteria if advance glaucomatous cupping was enrolled ,which medication pt received ? 3 side effect of this therapy? 4 Do the author measure CTVF? What the result before, and after and between the 2 groups?</p> <p>Probably , the revision is needed</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>I suggested the authors should select repeated measured ANOVA , it would strengthen the result of analytical part</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Parinee Kemchoknatee
Department, University & Country	Rangsit University, Thailand