

Manuscript: “**Effect Of Trabeculectomy On Ocular Biometry And Refractive Errors In Pediatric Glaucoma**”

**Submitted: 24 May 2021**

**Accepted: 09 August 2021**

**Published: 31 August 2021**

Corresponding Author: Nouhoum Guirou

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n29p291

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Ahed J. Alkhatib

Jordan University of Science and technology, Jordan

**Reviewer 2:** Aurela Saliaj

University of Vlora, Albania

**Reviewer 3:** Gherbon Adriana

University of Medicine and Pharmacy Victor Babes Timisoara, Romania

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Ahed J Alkhatib	
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>Effect of trabeculectomy on ocular biometry and refractive errors in pediatric glaucoma</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0613/2021</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**



***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received: <b>26-07-2021</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>29-07-2021</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>Effect of trabeculectomy on ocular biometry and refractive errors in pediatric glaucoma.</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>13.06.2021</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	

### Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The title is clear and represents clearly the article’s content.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The abstract is structured and clearly summarizes the article’s content.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>I have not noticed grammatical errors.</i>	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The study population and methods are explained with sufficient details. The results are elaborate with a reliable statistical analysis.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The results are clearly presented and correctly compared with other studies in this field.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The conclusions are clear and accurate.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The references are generally appropriate. However, according to the APA style the reference should be listed in alphabetic order.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Gherbon Adriana	
University/Country: University of Medicine and Pharmacy Victor Babes Timisoara, Romania	
Date Manuscript Received: 26.07.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 04.08.2021
Manuscript Title: Effect of trabeculectomy on ocular biometry and refractive errors in pediatric glaucoma	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0613/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No Yes	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</i>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Please put also the inclusion criteria on the study and describe the statistical methods.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Please put the Tables and Figure in the text and numbered the figure.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**