

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal of Applied Life Sciences International	
Ms_JALSI_47996	
Anatomical assessment of the eye of the African grasscutter (Thryonomys swinderianus)	
Original Research Article	
	Ms_JALSI_47996

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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 highlight that part in the manu his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	I HIGHLY RECOMMEND THIS MANUSCRIPT FOR PUBLICATION AFTER FILLING THE MISSING GAPS.	
	Authors should focus on the study design, if the aim was to describe the anantomy, histology or ocular biometry if this manuscript is to become a reference for future researchers.	
	From the anatomical prespective, 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 existance of the tapetum.	
	From the bometrical prespective, missing a great deal of measurements of intr-ocular structurs.	
Minor REVISION comments	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.	
	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%, epitelium 19% The table should be referred to within the text of the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	Line 93: It would be of a value if the authors can explaing the importance of the ratio of the eye-weight to body weight, otherwise it seems of no significance.	
	The vernier caliper is not as exact as using the ultrasound when taking eith intra/extra- ocular measurements (AC depth, axial, horizontal diameters, lens diameter, vitrous bodyetc). Ultrasound should be highly considered.	

PART 2:

		Author's comment (if agreed we highlight that part in the manuson 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:	El-Tookhy, Omar
Department, University & Country	Cairo University, Egypt

eed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and nuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write

d with reviewer, correct the manuscript and uscript. It is mandatory that authors should write