

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_112520
Title of the Manuscript:	Towards Improving Community Eye Care: Beneficiary Perspectives around an Inner-City Community in Lagos Metropolis
Type of the Article	

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? YES</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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. May be yes</p> <p>2: No, it states, "towards improving community eye care" Comments: How are the authors contributing towards improving the community eye care by just asking a few knowledge based questions. There is no awareness program undertaken or any intervention done therefore it seems to be inappropriate.</p> <p>The second part of the title stats "beneficiaries perspectives" Comments: About what? Therefore this title is not suitable , the title should be simple, specific and catchy Suggestion for the title: "<i>Knowledge, Attitude and Practice about good eye care amongst residents of Lagos Island Nigeria.</i></p> <p>4: Yes, A) But inclusion and exclusion criteria is not mentioned in the methodology. B) Conclusion is missing. A few lines (not more than) 5-6 should be added to the conclusion. C)Conflict of interest is not mentioned.</p> <p>5: Needs major revisions in the methodology . Study design and methodology needs to be checked again. Questions in the knowledge attitude and practice domains needs to be refined.</p> <p>6: Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>NO, needs to be worked on . Major revision needed</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Overall write up lacks clarity. 2. Unnecessary information needs to be omitted. 3. Repetition needs to be avoided. 4. Spacing and use of punctuation marks needs to be thoroughly checked. 5. Result needs to be specific and a clear take home message from the article is missing. 6. Inclusion exclusion criteria is not mentioned. 7. Sample size is mentioned different at two different palaces. 8. Referencing of the tables is missing in the text. 9. Conflict of interest is not motioned 10. Grammatical corrections needs to be done.</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:	Mehak Mufti
Department, University & Country	University of Kashmir, India