

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 article is interesting and reports a very rare pathology of the eyelid, showing also a list of differential diagnosis to take in consideration at everyday ophthalmology practice. 2. We suggest to change the order: GIANT EYELID ECCRINE HIDROCYSTOMA: CASE REPORT. 3. The abstract is very clear and shows a brief report of the article 4. Structure and subsections of article are appropriate and cover all topics 5. Yes, we consider that the manuscript is scientifically correct (we have some suggestions) 6. References are sufficient, but according to instructions for authors references should follow a specific style to cite them, also include abbreviations accepted in Medline. Reference #1 is incomplete. Authors should include DOI number if is available.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Yes, language (English) is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	Authors should correct numbers that numbers are separated with a space of the abbreviation of mm: 3-4 mm (page 1). In differential diagnosis (page 2) we suggest to add: trichilemmal cyst instead of trichilemmal. For Figure 4, we strongly suggest to include a better quality and more magnification photo in order to strengthen the diagnosis of an eccrine cyst over an apocrine cyst.	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maria Eugenia Orellana Torres
Department, University & Country	Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela