

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.	<p>This study makes findings suggest that these influential figures hold positive attitudes towards eye health and are willing to actively participate in prevention campaigns. This research opens up possibilities for collaboration between healthcare professionals and faith leaders in addressing the burden of glaucoma blindness in the region.</p> <p>While the study provides valuable insights, it has some limitations. It was conducted in a single Nigerian state, which limits the generalizability of the findings to other parts of Africa. Additionally, the cross-sectional design prevents establishing a causal relationship between faith leader involvement and reduced glaucoma blindness. Despite these limitations, the study's findings offer a promising avenue for further research and exploration of faith-based interventions in combating glaucoma blindness.</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate and informative.	
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 generally comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The current structure of the manuscript appears to be appropriate	
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 a solid foundation in scientific research methodology. The manuscript is technically sound, with well-structured subsections and a clear presentation of results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Good	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication,	
Optional/General comments	NA	

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:	V.V. Jaya Rama Krishnaiah
Department, University & Country	Koneru Lakshmaiah Education Foundation, India