



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_26503
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison between ultrasonic pachymetry and the scheimpflug based pentacam for assessment of central corneal thickness in myopic persons of Indian Sikh origin.
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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It is a nicely written article with some language flaws and very small number of eyes included in this observational study which makes the results very inconclusive and to say that it is in a sikh population based only on 50 eyes and all of them myopes with no emmetropic eyes included.	The aim of the study is to compare the central corneal thickness between Pentacam HR and Ultrasonic Pachymetry. Samples of larger size are necessary to calculate the mean CCT of the Indian Sikh population. It has been corrected as per the reviewers comments that the mean CCT value of the study can not be taken in to account as the mean CCT of Indian Sikh population.