

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_125244
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Epidemiological Concepts, Tools and Models, in understanding Primary Open Angle Glaucoma
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is well-structured and detailed, offering a clear path for further investigation into POAG. However, it could benefit from a more concise presentation of complex genetic interactions to enhance accessibility for a broader audience. Overall, its scientific importance is undeniable, as it bridges genetic theory with practical implications for disease management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Genetic Epidemiological Concepts, Tools, and Models in Understanding Primary Open Angle Glaucoma," effectively conveys the focus on the genetic and epidemiological aspects of POAG. However, it could be made more engaging and concise while still capturing the article's essence. A more streamlined alternative could be: "Genetic Insights and Epidemiological Models in Primary Open Angle Glaucoma"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is satisfactory and could benefit from streamlining and adding a focus on clinical implications.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, as they logically organize the complex genetic and epidemiological aspects of POAG.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it presents a thorough analysis of the genetic and molecular mechanisms underlying Primary Open Angle Glaucoma (POAG). The use of well-established research methodologies, such as genome-wide association studies (GWAS) and genetic mapping, strengthens the validity of its findings. Additionally, the manuscript accurately references key genes like MYOC and OPTN and their roles in disease progression, which are supported by current scientific literature. The inclusion of both experimental data from transgenic models and human genetic studies further reinforces its scientific accuracy and relevance to the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Hassan Sadek Darwish
Department, University & Country	Khawarizmi International College, United Arab Emirates