



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The 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, 37 eyes 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.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The origin of figure 1 and 2 are not adequately referenced Line 41 and 59 are they same reference i.e 12.3% 5.2 million Line 62 how high? Line 65 and 66, do you mean SLT or what clarify Line 127, given should be removed Line 165, correct the tense Line 169 remove in before anterior segment	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> 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	
---	---	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Saka Eletu Sadiat
Department, University & Country	Department of Ophthalmology, Federal Medical Centre Birnin, Nigeria