



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#"><u>Journal of Applied Life Sciences International</u></a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_47996
Title of the Manuscript:	Anatomical assessment of the eye of the African grasscutter ( <i>Thryonomys swinderianus</i> )
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**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	<p><b>I HIGHLY RECOMMEND THIS MANUSCRIPT FOR PUBLICATION <u>AFTER</u> FILLING THE MISSING GAPS.</b></p> <p>Authors should focus on the study design, if the aim was to describe the anatomy, histology or ocular biometry if this manuscript is to become a reference for future researchers.</p> <p>From the anatomical perspective, there are no anatomical gross pictures. The manuscript focuses on microscopical structures rather than the anatomical features. All examined parts should be photographed. This will help to prove some written observations such as the absence or existence of the tapetum.</p> <p>From the biometrical perspective, missing a great deal of measurements of intra-ocular structures.</p>	<p>Corrections have been made as stated,</p> <p>Gross anatomical pictures have been added. As at the time the study was conducted, there was no available ophthalmoscope to obtain fundic images to prove the absence or existence of the tapetum</p> <p>Other intraocular biometrics have been added.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Line 118: (Figure-1) the 3 figures are missing the appropriate labels (a,b,c), also the Corneal endothelium (N) needs to be placed on the graph where the black arrow points.</p> <p>Line 142: Table 1: Authors are advised to add a column of % for corneal components in relation to the total measured cornea for a better representation. Example the corneal endothelium represents about 3% out of the total corneal tissue, stroma 78%, epithelium 19%</p> <p>The table should be referred to within the text of the manuscript.</p>	<p>All missing labels have been added.</p> <p>Column for percentage has been added.</p> <p>The table has been referred to in the text of the manuscript.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Line 93: It would be of a value if the authors can explain the importance of the ratio of the eye-weight to body weight, otherwise it seems of no significance.</p> <p>The vernier caliper is not as exact as using the ultrasound when taking either intra/extra-ocular measurements (AC depth, axial, horizontal diameters, lens diameter, vitreous body...etc). Ultrasound should be highly considered.</p>	<p>The ratio seems insignificant. The statement indicating the ratio has been expunged from the article.</p> <p>Noted. Consideration will be made in future studies.</p>

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