



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_24160
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening for Ophthalmic Disorders Among Deaf School Children in Nigeria- A Neglected Population.
Type of the Article	Original article: cross-sectional study.

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	Abstract: line 15 “rest (n=4,3.5%) had low vision between < 6/18 and 6/60.” I did not understand the percentage inside the paragraphs. Rewrite. - Line 16 and 17: “Significant causes of low vision include optic atrophy of unknown cause, cupped discs presumably from chronic glaucoma and macular scarring.” Cupped discs presumably from glaucoma don't make sense. Rewrite. Introduction: - line 49: explain the CHARGE syndrome, that means the abbreviation. - Line 50: explain Wadenburg syndrome also. Material and Methods: - Written informed consent was obtained from all participants??? And the	Line 15 The remaining 4 students had low vision(3.5%) Line 16 and 17 rewritten Line 49 CHARGE syndrome explained Waardenburg syndrome explained Group Written informed consent obtained from parents teachers association and the principal Institutional review board approval was obtained. Similarly the tenets of the declaration of Helsinki was adhered to Line 49 and 50 explained



SDI Review Form 1.6

	institutional review board approved all methods???? yes 2) All methods adhered to the Declaration of Helsinki??? If yes, please add similar information.yes 3) Exclusion and inclusion criteria should be added in the methods section.(added now) 4) Which p value was set as statistically significant????(0.05) Results: 1) SD in line 83: explain the meaning: standard deviation. (done) 2) Add gender(already there in line 89) and race(done) if you have it. 3) Line 91: “examined with 28 eyes having one ophthalmic abnormality or the other.” In how many patients????(check wit chukuka) 4) Line 95: explain and characterize better ptosis: mild, moderate or advanced??? The same for exotropia.(done) 5) What about study limitations? The lack of additional systemic info, the way you measured the visual acuity or IOP using Perkins etc. Please address these issues.(done)	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	6) Discuss more about the clinical findings and the diseases found it in these study.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Review table 1 format. No vertical lines and some horizontal lines should be eliminated.	done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		