



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	

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	I consider this study to have valuable data that would be of interest if published however it needs a major revision before publication. There are some major concerns that should be addressed. First is the ethical issue – I could not find information whether this study adhered to the provisions of the Declaration of Helsinki, if it was approved by any ethic committee and what kind of consent was obtained from the study subjects ? Second is the presentation of the results: there should be more tables i.e. table for demographic data, table or graph for visual acuity data, table or graph with causes of visual impairment etc. One table with the abnormalities is not enough. Third is the conclusion section: in my opinion is too long and some of the conclusions are not drawn from the results of this study. Please clarify the ethical issue: I could not find information whether this study adhered to the provisions of the Declaration of Helsinki, if it was approved by any ethic committee and what kind of consent was obtained from the study subjects ?	1. Ethical considerations unintentionally omitted in body of manuscript now inserted. Group written consent from parent teachers association and from principal was taken. (Line 64 and 65) already stated here. Conclusion streamlined The ethical issue unintentionally left out has been inserted. Group written consent was taken from the Parent teachers association in addition to that of the principal
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		