



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_15409
Title of the Manuscript:	Visual Training Helps Improve Reading in Dyslexic Children with Abnormal Crowding
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	In the Abstract, change the p values with the raw scores that are more informative: In the Results section, add the following clarifications: - Explain the meaning of the $\pm$ values, e.g. standard deviations, confidence intervals?; - Follow up comparisons are sufficient with respect to the T2 condition; In the Discussion section, acknowledge some limitations of the study: - The use of an original cumulative reading rate as dependent measure and not of a standardized reading measure;	If with the term "score" the reviewer refers to the value used to report the relevance of our findings, in the abstract scores are reported before the results of the statistical analysis. $\pm$ Values are referred to standard deviations. The clarification has been added in the result section (and table 1: line 141, 193). The use of CRR rather than a standardized reading measure has been an intentional choice. In fact we believe the CRR accounts for the reading performance of the subject suffering from reinforced crowding in a more comprehensive way compared to the standardized reading measure. So, it should not be seen as a shortcoming. As declared in the section 2.2, CRR is computed by averaging the reading rates obtained at different interletter spacings. Now, by averaging reading rate values from narrower- to wider-than standard spacing we expect CRR to be a more veridical index of reading performance compared to the conventional 0.4 deg-spacing. The latter, in fact,



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- The missing of 6/14 participants at T3; - The short, 4-weeks, interval to test the follow up situation; - The small sample of the “reverse group”; - The comparison with the results of the previous study (please cite on line 225) cannot be done without an estimation of the parameters (i.e. confidence intervals) or a statistical comparison.	than does not consider the higher-than expected difficulty of such patients to read in more demanding conditions (spacing lower than 0.4 deg) or, in turn, the higher-than expected facilitation in reading strings with interletter spacings wider than 0.4 deg. This consideration has been embedded in the text (lines 95-102). The 2nd, 3rd, 4th limitations highlighted by the reviewer have been acknowledged (lines 260-2639). Some of the parameters of the previous study have been reported in the discussion session (see in particular lines 218-221, lines 232-238, and figure 4). For details, the reader can refer to the previously published article (Aleci ey al, 2013, ref. nb.34).
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I did not check if the manuscript format adheres to the journal’s guidelines.	