

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_OR_106817</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Interrupted versus Running Sutures for Amniotic Membrane Fixation in cases of Resistant Infected Corneal Ulcers</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The article subject is important as treatment of refractory infectious corneal ulcers remains to be a challenge for ophthalmologists The title of the article is suitable The abstract is comprehensive, <b>but statistical results should be added</b> Subsections and structure are appropriate The manuscript is scientifically correct and the authors appropriately discussed their results and compared it with results of other similar studies, <b>but statistical results mentioned in tables should be added to the text.</b> References are sufficient and many of them were recent</p> <p>Reviewer Impression: The data was clear, carry benefit to the reader and add an addition to the current status of knowledge. <b>Authors should have reflected the statistical study values mentioned in tables in the abstract and text</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Language is good, few words needs spelling correction.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Arwa Azmeh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Damascus University, Syria</b>