



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_50876
Title of the Manuscript:	Socio demographic Distribution of Ocular Axial Length in Port Harcourt, Nigeria
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I consider this study to have valuable data that would be of interest if published however it needs a major revision before publication. There are three major concerns. 2. One is the methods section: the authors should describe here the study population and all performed measurements. 3. Instead of it, a lot of data from previously published studies are written here. These information should be places either in the introduction or in the discussion sections. 4. The other major concern is the English grammar and spelling, whole MS should be checked by a native speaker. 5. The last major concern is ethical issue, I could not find information about the informed consent. 6. One more minor remark is to the introduction section: in one line the authors has written that the axial length in adults is 23 mm and in the next line they provided value of 24 mm, so it should be cleared. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thanks 2. Noted, methodology which was initially omitted has been included and updated. 3. Yes, actually part of the introduction. It was an error which has been corrected. Methodology has been included. 4. Noted 5. Noted 6. It describes axial length in different age groups
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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?	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p> <p>Yes, I could not find information about the informed consent.</p>	No ethical issues