

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_100737</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Correlation between optical coherence tomography ganglion cell layer analysis and visual field in cases of benign intracranial hypertension</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for the scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Very significant.</b> A well-appreciated title selection has been projected. * Basic idea of coherence tomography, intracranial hypertension with its significance in the work. Must be mentioned in the abstract. * Problem definition with numerical should be mentioned and supported with citations. * Introduction to the types of diseases that are essential like Edema, papilledema, and Glaucoma. etc. * Introduction for the parameters has to be elaborative (BCVA), (IOP), slit lamp biomicroscope examination including assessment of papilledema grade, automated perimetry in dim light to evaluate their visual field using SITA fast Standard 30-2 protocol by Humphrey Field Analyzer etc.) and essential for starting researchers to understand your work. * Data is sufficient, but projecting/ representation of the data can be improved better by incorporating graphs, and charts for effective understanding. * The projected work is interlinked with the Optical disc and retina, try to be specific in defining your unique work focus. (Relevant to which part of the eye disease authors want to project the Correlation between optical coherence tomography ganglion cell layer analysis and visual field in cases of benign intracranial hypertension.) *Operation of optical coherence tomography is required with its comparative merits over other optical methods. (For effective presentation try to refer to diagrammatic information.) * In the image analysis process segmentation methods and procedures and comparative analysis is suggested. (The retrieving process of anatomical parameters specifically) * Method for detection used in the proposed system is insufficient. * Can you elaborate on the procedure (basic idea missing) *Can you provide more details on your work detailing the approaches? * What could be the major problems you have observed in our work regarding the application? * Achievements/ strengths of your work.</li> <li>2. It's better to have a specific title specifying the attributes and disease.</li> <li>3. Foundational ( basic introduction) information on the disease types, parameters and the measuring device must be incorporated.</li> <li>4. It would be better to recheck the flow for better understanding.</li> <li>5. Yes</li> <li>6. Major work in this area has been done it would be great if authors could compare the recent relevant work.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Satisfactory Organisation and flow work only must be focused.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Work has a good scope. Suggested for rechecking of workflow and incorporating of basics and representation of uniqueness with relevant comparative results will be given a better enhancement.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Neelapala Anilkumar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Alliance University, India</b>