



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_OR_18395
Title of the Manuscript:	CONJUNCTIVAL FOREIGN BODY A RARE PRESENTATION.
Type of the Article	Case Report

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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The authors have presented an interesting case report but the article was poorly written. English language review and correction by a native speaker is mandatory. The patient was hit by wooden stick. How? In which situation? What is his occupation? The wooden foreign bodies were removed. And how was the follow-up? Topical therapy following the procedure? How long it took until the patient heal? The lesion completely regret after wooden removal? References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets.	I agree with Reviewer's comments and corrected the Manuscript. The Reviewers comments helps in improving the standard of scientific presentation.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	To enrich the paper, the authors should discuss the possible mechanisms involved in the pedunculated polyp-like growth.	