

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_99923
Title of the Manuscript:	A CASE REPORT OF GIANT EYELID ECCRINE HIDROCYSTOMA
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.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)
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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript is important because very rare cases of eccrine hidrocystoma. 2. The title is suitable for the article. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. 4. The structure of the manuscripts is appropriate. 5. The article is scientifically correct but the surgical steps (antibiotics, painkiller, etc) are missing 6. The reference 1 needs to be completed: is it a book? A manuscript? Etc, date, year, journal, Pages. 7. Latin words (in toto...) must be written in italic. The surgical steps are missing in the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor English editing must be performed over the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well written but requires English editing. It is easy to read it and understand the subject, which is very important in the scientific and medical field.	

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:	Joan Oliva
Department, University & Country	USA