

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_123791
Title of the Manuscript:	GLAUCOMA BLINDNESS PREVENTION IN AFRICA: THE ROLE OF FAITH LEADERS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 addresses a critical gap in the literature regarding the role of faith-based leaders in preventing glaucoma-related blindness. It provides valuable insights into how socio-demographic factors influence willingness to engage in advocacy, thereby highlighting a need for targeted educational interventions. The findings could foster collaboration between healthcare professionals and faith leaders, enhancing community awareness and action against preventable blindness.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title Suitability The title effectively reflects the core focus of the study, but to enhance clarity and impact, I suggest the alternative title: "Engaging Faith-Based Leaders in the Fight Against Glaucoma-Related Blindness"	
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 provides a good overview but could benefit from more specific details about the methodology and findings. I recommend adding a sentence summarizing the study design and a brief mention of the key statistical outcomes to enhance clarity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured, with appropriate subsections that guide the reader through the research. Each section is clearly defined, allowing for a logical flow of information.	
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.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness by employing valid research methods and presenting statistically sound findings. The lack of significant associations strengthens the argument for the need for improved educational interventions, which is well-supported by the data. Overall, the conclusions drawn align with the presented results, ensuring technical soundness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally sufficient, although a few additional recent studies addressing similar themes would enhance the manuscript's comprehensiveness. Consider including literature from the last five years to stay current.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language Quality The language and overall quality of English in the manuscript are suitable for scholarly communication. However, minor grammatical adjustments could improve overall clarity and flow.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The research opens up a significant dialogue about the intersection of faith and public health, inviting further studies in diverse faith contexts to broaden the understanding of community engagement in health advocacy.</p> <p>There do not appear to be any ethical issues with the manuscript as presented. The study seems to follow appropriate ethical standards for research involving human participants, including informed consent.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Mahsa Rezasoltani</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>United States</p>