SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_OR_22164**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A STUDY OF SELECTIVE LASER TRABECULOPLASTY AS ADJUNCTIVE TREATMENT IN PATIENTS AFFECTED BY OPEN ANGLE GLAUCOMA FOR CONTROL OF INTRAOCULAR PRESSURE IN INDIAN EYES**
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	**1T.he results are not detailed, it is essential to see the overall result before stating the means. Abstract was repeated as result** **2.Reference is not right: where are reference 12-25, and in between these 26,49,51,53,58,59,60,62,67,71(not chronological)** **3.Line 186, any statistical value to back the statement up?** **4.205, your finding, what do you mean** **5.You said in line 149 in the discussion that 29 eyes of 29 patients, and then in tab 1, 37eyes of 33 patients please check** **6. in your result 24 males whereas in your limitation 28 males please check** **7. the review of past studies shown in table 1 is not part of the objective of your study. Please correct.**	Respected sir , Thanks for the precious time for the review. Arranged reference in the chronological order. Results section is brief but , salient points I have stressed in the discussion section. Rest corrections done as per your advice.
Minor REVISION comments	The origin of figure 1 and 2 are not adequately referenced Line41 and 59 are they same reference i.e 12.3% 5.2 million Line 62 how high? Line65 and66, it do you mean SLT or what clarify Line127,given should be remove Line 165, correct the tense Line169 remove in before anterior segment	
Optional/General comments	A very good study but long term follow up will be nice, Also sample size of 29 is really small to make inference. In the introduction, 40 yrs was coated but in inclusion >18 yrs was mentioned; why	