



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_24972
Title of the Manuscript:	My experience with Levator Resection Surgery in Congenital Ptosis
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	ABSTRACT : Methods: Line 10 ... before LPS abbreviation, the full form of it should be written and the abbreviation should be put within brackets. Results: Line 25 ... after 7 eyes, percentage should be written within brackets. Line 26 ... after 2 eyes, percentage should be written within brackets. After key words ... line 30 should be removed. INTRODUCTION: Line 33 ... the number 2 should be removed. SUBJECTS AND METHODS: Line 40 ,, starting of sentence should be with words and not with number. This should be corrected. Line 86 ... 'e/o' should be written as "eye ointment" Line 97 ... the word 'observations' should be written as "RESULTS" Before line 114 , postoperative results The amount of LPS resection done for moderate ptosis and for severe ptosis should be written.	Abstract- All the errors corrected. Introduction- Line 33 corrected. Subjects and Methods-Errors corrected. Results- Errors corrected. Discussion has been rewritten. Recent References added. More Levator resection studies included. Table 1 revised. Figures have been given legends. Intraoperative Photo included. Correction are effected in the manuscript



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Lines 115 and 116 ... starting of sentence should be with words and not number. This needs correction. Line 116 ... after 2 cases percentage should be written within brackets. Line 119 ... the word 'entropion' should be written as "trichiasis" as per the content of the statement. Lin 121 ... number 2 should be written as "Two". Discussion: When the author has not done any "Brow suspension operation" in this study, one should not write about it in the discussion. Hence, lines 137 to 155 should be removed. One should discuss about LPS surgery only in the discussion. Majority of the references written in the discussion are very old. The results of the studies published after 2000 (10-15 years) should be compared with the present study in the discussion. The whole discussion section should be rewritten. References: Majority of references are very old except 3 references which are after 2000 (nos.11,16,17) <i>There will be lot of references in the past 10-15 years on LPS resection which should be written. The author has to</i>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<i>look for these references in Pubmed, Science direct and Google search in the internet.</i> Table 1, Table 2 : Should be removed as this data is written in sentences form in the results. Figures and Legend : Below each photo, the figure number and legend should be written so that it is easy to look for the findings in the photos. *** The sentences written as “power point presentation slides” should be written as complete sentences. The revised paper with detailed reply to all the comments in the next column should be submitted to the editor for further review.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The writing of the paper is poor. Lot of grammar corrections are needed. Type errors of words should be corrected. It appears that the author has presented this work in some conference and converted the power point slides into paper writing.	