



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_38770
Title of the Manuscript:	Keys To Solve Park – 3 Step Test
Type of the Article	Short communication

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The paper highlights the standard park 3 step test followed worldwide. All the steps mentioned to diagnose the relevant muscle palsy have been explained in numerous texts. It is merely a repetition of standard practice followed.</p> <p>Plagiarism issue: https://www.macfarlaneoptometrist.com.au/Parks-Three-Step-Tool?landingpage=Parks-Three-Step-Tool http://www.eyedock.com/parks-3-step</p>	<p>YES, YOU ARE ABSOLUTELY RIGHT THAT IT IS MENTIONED IN NUMEROUS TEXTS.</p> <p>BUT OUR MAIN AIM IS TO SIMPLIFY THE TECHNIQUE OF STANDARD PARK'S 3 STEP TEST WHICH IS NOT MENTIONED IN ANY TEXT BOOKS AS PER MY KNOWLEDGE</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	No written text to highlight the authors contribution in framing the key to solving the Park 3 step test is given.	