



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_26236
Title of the Manuscript:	To study the role of conservative management and to evaluate effectiveness of syringing and probing in children with congenital nasolacrimal duct obstruction in a tertiary care institution of Kashmir
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:

(<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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In the Abstract page 1 lines # 11 and 12 congenital nasolacrimal duct obstruction is double. You can use an acronym, for instance. Page 2 line 62 were must be changed to where. Page 3 line 94Of must be changed to of. All the manuscript must be formatted in the same way as font. Page 5 line 118 rate... of is pleonastic. Page 5 line 135 drew inferences is double and must be corrected. Page 6 line 145 In view of above must be changed to Therefore... References must be formatted according to the Journal Author's guidelines.	Respected sir / madam the necessary changes have been made and highlighted as pointed out by the honourable reviewer. Thanks and regards
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	None.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	None.	