

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 article is important for glaucoma because it provides a comprehensive understanding of the genetic and molecular mechanisms underlying primary open-angle glaucoma (POAG). It highlights the role of gene mutations, particularly in MYOC and OPTN, in causing POAG, which affects the optic nerve and leads to vision loss. The article discusses how genetic predisposition, inheritance patterns, and epigenetic factors contribute to disease progression. It also explores various biological pathways and potential genetic therapies, advancing the diagnosis and treatment of glaucoma SEE ATTACHMENT	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable	
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 comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes please review the document I adjuncts with English Grammar corrections, paragraphs and the new numeration of some sections if is correct as mu suggest	
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 appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its thorough exploration of genetic and molecular mechanisms in primary open-angle glaucoma (POAG). It integrates a broad range of studies, including genetic mutations like MYOC and OPTN, and explains their role in disease progression through detailed biological pathways. The manuscript also demonstrates methodological rigor by discussing various genetic tools such as genome-wide association studies (GWAS), linkage analysis, and epigenetic mechanisms. This comprehensive approach, combined with references to empirical data and current research, supports the manuscript's scientific accuracy and relevance	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	I suggest if is possible to actualize some reference from last 5 years	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, a little changes	
Optional/General comments	I prepared a corrected document to review I add to this Revision If is possible include a little graphic or schemes because for chapter the lector likes to see visual infographies and also for increase citations	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Paatricia Durán Ospina
Department, University & Country	Universidad Técnica de Manabí, Ecuador