



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
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	The case should be presented with clinically features in the abstract section. Diagnostic methods and complications should be mentioned in the discussion section. Discussion section is very weak. This section should be broadened and current articles should be referred such as "Liu D. Common denominators in retained orbital wooden foreign body. Ophthal Plast Reconstr Surg. 2010 Nov-Dec;26(6):454-8." There are a lot of grammatical errors in the manuscript. It should be reviewed again in respect to grammatical errors.	I agree with Reviewer's comments and corrected the Manuscript. The Reviewers comments helps in improving the standard of scientific presentation.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	What happened to granulomatous tissue? References should be numerated in the manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript had been carelessly prepared, it could be better written.	