



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_14477
Title of the Manuscript:	Optovue Optical Coherence Tomography as an Imaging Modality for Scleral Thickness
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	- Line 5-6 : The authors state that the purpose of the article is to use Optovue OCT as a tool to measure scleral thickness in patients with "a variety of ocular diseases" yet the article doesn't say which scleral diseases these patients had (if any). Were these healthy patients? - Table 1: too long and detailed. Age, sex and race are "unknown"? Looks awkward in a peer review journal. How can that even possible in a "prospective" study??? - Why certain patients had so many measurements and some had only 2? How can the numbers be an "average of 3 measurements" ("in each location"...which means there should be at least 6 measurements per eye). Yet, in some patients only 2 measurements were made total... - Please explain in the text the discrepancies between this paper and the ARVO abstract from 2013 with the same title (and I guess the same authors). In the ARVO abstract : "The boundary of the conjunctiva and sclera was easily distinguishable in 78/124 total measurements (63%)" while in the current text: "The boundary of the conjunctiva and	- The subjects were patients from a retina and uveitis clinic with no scleral diseases. We have added this information to the Abstract (lines 7-8) and Results section (line 54). - We deleted the 2 subjects of unknown age and gender and simplified Table 1 to condense the presentation of the data. The mean scleral thickness and mean standard deviation values have been updated (lines 12-13 and 58-59). - All subjects had several scans; however, only those scans with clear boundaries between the sclera and conjunctiva were included for the measurement data. Thus, some eyes had more scans than others, but the average was 3 scans (lines 42-44). - All scans in the present manuscript had a readily identifiable boundary between the sclera and conjunctiva. The present manuscript includes data in addition to that in the ARVO abstract, and all scans that were



SDI Review Form 1.6

	sclera was easily distinguishable" (line 54). Please note in how many patients it was easy to distinguish and in how many it was not so easy. In the ARVO abstract they made 6 measurements per location and here only 3 (Line 52). How can that be? Are these totally new patients?	difficult to interpret in the ARVO abstract were excluded from analysis. We have added text to this effect in the Results section (lines 59-63 and reference #18, lines 141-142).
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The article: <i>"Measurement of scleral thickness using swept-source optical coherence tomography in patients with open-angle glaucoma and myopia"</i> in AJO from last April should be cited. 2. I would replace "sexes" with "genders" throughout the text	1. That excellent article studied posterior scleral thickness using swept-source OCT, which was not the objective of the present study. Therefore, we would prefer not to cite that article. 2. We have replaced the term "sex" with "gender" in Table 1, given that subjects were not specifically identified by sex per se.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	A photo demonstrating the area being measured with marking as described will be helpful for the reader	We would be willing to provide a drawing of the area being measured, if required.