



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_14907
Title of the Manuscript:	Calcinosis cutis of the eyelid
Type of the Article	Case Study

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	On page # 1 line 7 sinister can be replaced by different. Why did you write PIC and not Fig. #...? On page # 1 line 27 clacinosis of course is calcinosis. Please clarify all the acronyms (like HPE) the first time that they are used in the paper. On page # 2 line 47 to finish a sentence please write a full stop.	1. I have changed the word sinister to dangerous 2. I have changed picture to figure 3. I have checked the spelling of calcinosis 4. I have expanded the acronym HPE 5. I have completed the sentence with a full stop
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The References must all be formatted in the same way.	I have formatted all references in a similar manner
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This case report is well written by an English speaking writer.	