

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_89377
Title of the Manuscript:	Hang-Back Technique versus Conventional Lateral Rectus Recession in Exotropia
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy> )

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The study is very interesting. The idea of using the OCT to check the muscle position was great! The surgical techniques were well described and detailed! In the Introduction, it is mentioned that there is two surgical techniques to treat exotropia, which is not true (the recession-resection technique was not cited). It must be corrected. There is no mention of the randomization of the patients – how the patients were divided into the groups – if it was in sequence or based on some criteria. Besides, the results should be more explained. It is only showed the tables, but there is no explanation nor interpretation of them. And there is no explanation of how the authors came with the conclusion that one technique was better than other.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	It could be said the reasons why the authors chose the time of 1,5 months to do the OCT after the surgery.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Josie Naomi Iyeyasu
Department, University & Country	State University of Campinas, Brazil