

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_118674
Title of the Manuscript:	Amplitude of Accommodation in young Greek adults, 18 - 28 years old
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>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, it is scientifically important.</p> <p>2. No. I would suggest, "Amplitude of Accommodation in young adults in Greek"</p> <p>3. The abstract should be comprehensive, but to the point and well summarized. But, in this case there is too much parole in the introduction section that could be cut out. In the methods section, a more technical term would be better utilised. It gives the abstract a very amateur perception.</p> <p>4. The subsections are appropriate but the structure isn't appropriate at all. The tables could be structured in a way they include more info than only 2 columns that aren't that descriptive.</p> <p>5. I have my doubts in the Amplitude of Accommodation for the hyperopes. The reference are sufficient but I haven't cross checked them, and I would suggest that you do that considering the poor research article this is.</p> <p>6. The reference are sufficient</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Not at all. The article needs to use better words, like PRA in the first place instead of minus blur. It is absolutely not written for eye professionals, it has very childish writing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is an absolutely poor article with it's doubtful results, poor articulation and even worse presentation.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tsige Mnasie Smret
Department, University & Country	Biet Mekae Community Hospital, Eritrea