

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_OR_113910</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>RETINITIS PIGMENTOSA IN AWKA, NIGERIA</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>Title may be written as <b>RETINITIS PIGMENTOSA IN AWKA, NIGERIA-A SURVEY STUDY</b></p> <p><b>Background may be needed in abstract.</b></p> <p><b>Yes. Mention the definition/features of Retinitis pigmentosa in material and method section that you want to select.</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>References are sufficient but there are repetition of references and are need to be rearrange the sequences in text.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>Result section should be rearranged and need to checked for English grammar.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. Regarding Presentation of data, there should be graphical presentation of result, eg. pie chart for –occupational and sex distribution of patient.</p> <p>2. Discussion can be minimised, it's too long.</p> <p>3. Too much repetition of references.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Manisha Waghulkar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Regional Ayurveda Research Institute, India</b>