

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_OR_106070</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Determination of Age-Related Variations with Orbital Dimensions of the Orbit based on Plain Radiographs</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> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This manuscript is not that interesting because it has been reported for a very long time</p> <p>2. The title of this article is too long. It should be more concise.</p> <p>3. Conclusion section of abstract must contain important findings of the paper and clinical significance.</p> <p>4. Introduction part and Material &amp; Methods are not appropriate because author added some figures and did not cite them the text.</p> <p>5. This manuscript is scientifically appropriate.</p> <p>6. Reviewer comments: - Introduction section 1. I recommend author remove Figure1. - Materials and Methods section 1. Authors should cite Figure 2, and Figure 3 in the text. 2. For figure 3, authors should add definitions of all abbreviations in the figure. 3. Authors must add more information of sample groups in the first paragraph.</p> <p>Minor comments - Authors should check the manuscript more carefully because there are many typos in the result section.</p> <p>General Questions: 1. Why classification by sex not performed? Previous study (Shaib 2022) demonstrated that females have more expanded morphology with age. 2. Was there intra or inter observer reliability test in this study? 3. How many times an observer makes a measurement? 4. Why author use both of 1-10 yrs and 6-10 yrs to compare the orbital dimensions?</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Appropriate	
<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:	Laphatrada Yurasakpong
Department, University & Country	Mahidol University, Thailand