

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Ophthalmology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRROP_111892
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPORTANCE OF CHOOSING INTRAOCULAR IMPLANTS AFTER EVISCERATION
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?</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. Yes , this manuscript highlights importance of adverse events which may result in the course of evisceration with implant and choice of implant is very crucial in this regard.</p> <p>2. The title needs a little consideration in terms of amendment. In my humble opinion, it does not go well with the manuscript , it should be along these lines...for instance, “ A comprehensive overview of implant exposure 5 years post-evisceration with hydroxyapatite implant: A case report “. etc</p> <p>3. The abstract provides a concise overview of the case of implant complication after evisceration. However, it is humbly suggested that for improved clarity it can be organized into subsections like objective, case description, clinical findings, intervention, outcome etc.</p> <p>4. Subsections are fine but the case presentation section could have been more elaborative. For instances, which events lead to the development of this complication in patient, anything significant in history should be provided if any, or excluded if none. Patient's comorbities if any should have been given consideration . A few words about patients follow up visit would be appreciated. Also give appropriate titles to the picture . i.e 3rd and 4th doesn't make sense. Please suggest alternatives.</p> <p>5. Yes it seems scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. All referances are old and none is recent i.e from past 5 years. It is suggested to place new reference and corresponding text according to recent advances.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	It is a nicely written piece of manuscript however a few suggestions are enclosed for guidance and amendments.	

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:	Rabeeah Zafar
Department, University & Country	Al-Shifa Trust Eye Hospital, Pakistan