



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_20797
Title of the Manuscript:	Retinal nerve fiber layer thickness in normal Indian pediatric population of north India measured with optical coherence tomography
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors should consider revising their heading and the use of 'terms' such as "normal Indian" population. Please refer to main comment for further explanation. Keywords: "retinal nerve fibre layer in children" should maybe be broken into two 'keywords' such as retinal nerve fibre layer; children... Abstract: Abstract contains excluding criteria that do not coincide with the criteria that are part of the material and methods. Acronyms such as "RNFL" should initially be written out in full. Terms such as "rural" should be excluded as they hold no value with regards to the chosen subject matter. Comments regarding the introduction and the rest of the manuscript: there is too much material that has been presented regarding a well-known technique, and thus this part of the manuscript is to be added to with material concerning the thickness of nerve fibers in children that have been placed in a particular age and racial groups. Namely, analysis of nerve fiber layer thickness in children is to be supplemented with data that coincides with smaller age groups i.e. the group 5 – 17 should be divided and statistical analysis made accordingly. Ethical information and the likes should go at the end of the manuscript under a separate "heading".	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Starting from material that concerns including and excluding criteria onwards, the authors are to change the order in which it has been written and divide it into appropriate sections including materials and methods (i.e. maybe starting from the sentence on line 80 onwards). Whilst changing the order, the authors are to consider placing the criteria behind the previously mentioned, followed by their own results. Materials and methods should be supplemented with “59 normal Indian children (117eyes)”, and obtained results with analysis that is in accordance with the above mentioned comments concerning different age and racial groups. Results that have been represented in tabular form suggest that other authors used different apparatus from authors of this manuscript and as such cannot be used for this kind of analysis. From the presented material, it is obvious that the authors of this manuscript obtained values that were lower than those of other authors who, on the other hand, used the same device. If the subject at hand requires that there be adequate comparison made between various thicknesses of nerve fibres in a particular population, besides exclusion of all criteria that could be of influence, then the analysis is adequate only if it is performed in a similar manner and with the same equipment. It would have been more appropriate, and of greater value, had the authors performed their research with regards to age and race as, as it stands, it seems as if the thickness of nerve fibres varies / is subject to differences in geographic location. Table 2 is not completely understandable. Instead of	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	showing differences between particular racial groups, authors showed that there exists a distinction between certain geographic locations, which based on provided statistical data, in it self, is not that obvious to conclude. Comment regarding malnutrition and nerve fibre layer thickness is not adequate. Discussion section is to be rewritten, and the authors need to compare their own results with those of other authors. I am of the opinion that before this material is ready to be published the authors need to approach their subject matter differently; divide their participants into appropriate groups; supplement their results; and exclude all unnecessary data from both their material and discussion sections.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jelena Paovic
Department, University & Country	Department of Ophthalmology , University Eye Clinic, Belgrade, Serbia