

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_106180
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Gender Variations Based on Anatomical Shapes of the Orbit on Plain Radiographs
Type of the Article	Retrospective Cross Sectional Studies

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Clinical application of Cephalometry is individualistic. In my view, Radiograph won't be an ideal way of measuring the orbital cavity. In spite of any expertise radiologist intervention measurement of a 3 Dimensional structure in a 2 Dimensional image. References of earlier studies conducted with the help of MRI and CT are quoted. Only height, width of orbital margin is not enough to define the shape. Because shape of orbit is approximately square shape with rounded corners.</p> <p>Incomplete title – need to precise as per the protocol like – it should clearly suggest what type of study is being done, etc items should be reflected</p> <p>Yes. Abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>AIM & OBJECTIVE section is missing in article. References in Vancouver style in superscript manner not followed</p> <p>Yes, Manuscript is correct. But the methodology used is not ideal which might have lot of subjective errors.</p> <p>References need to be quoted in the article</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	A. B. Biradar
Department, University & Country	University – KLE Academy of Higher Education and Researches, Shri BMK AM, India