



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_50496
Title of the Manuscript:	CORRELATION BETWEEN OCULAR AXIAL LENGTH AND BODY MASS INDEX IN A BLACK POPULATION
Type of the 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:

(<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		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>(1). Please review your citations in the text. They should be indicated by normal reference number, and not superscript. They should preferably be enclosed in brackets [ ], as stated in the authors' guidelines at <a href="http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/23/">www.sciencedomain.org/journal/23/</a> authors-instruction. Refer for further clarifications.</p> <p>(2).Kindly include the names and models of the instruments used for the ocular examinations (measurements of VA, applanation tonometry and ophthalmoscopy, as stated in your materials and methods.</p> <p>(3). Kindly refer to guidelines for reporting <i>P</i> values on the authors guidelines, for further clarifications and review.</p>	<p>1. Noted and corrected</p> <p>2. Noted and done</p> <p>3. Noted</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>That was a perfect work. This article was well written. The Study Design, The Population Sampling, Abstract, Methodology and Results were well documented. The explanation of the Results, referencing the Tables and figures were natural in flow and clear to understand. The Tables and Figures were also self explanatory. In the Discussion, the test statistics for any significant difference in ocular parameters compared, using p values, was properly applied, and the outcome of the comparison with other authors work, duly established. Please see manuscript</p> <p><b>Red</b> highlights signifies: delete / make corrections</p> <p><b>Green</b> highlights signifies: add / guide to correction</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Noted</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>	No ethical issues