



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_26569
Title of the Manuscript:	Optic Disc Drusen, Important Detail In The Differential Diagnosis Of Optic Disc Edema
Type of the Article	Case Report

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	I read with great interest your article entitled “Optic Disc Drusen, Important Detail In The Differential Diagnosis Of Optic Disc Edema” submitted for publication to the Ophthalmology Research. This is a highly valuable issue. However, there are some important points to be addressed. 1. There are numerous grammatical mistakes. So, English grammar should be checked. 2. There are numerous punctuation and spelling errors, they should be corrected. 3. You should obtain a signed statement from the patient's parents. 4. “Figure-4a: OCT of right optic nerves showing elevated optic nerve heads and peripapillary RNFL thinning” and “ Figure-4b: OCT of left optic nerves showing elevated optic nerve heads and peripapillary RNFL thinning” must be corrected. Peripapillary RNFL thickening was observed. 5. You should add about differentiating optic disc edema from optic nerve head drusen by Optical Coherence Tomography to the discussion section. (Bassi ST, Mohana KP. Optical coherence tomography in papilledema and pseudopapilledema with and without optic nerve head drusen. Indian J Ophthalmol. 2014 Dec;62(12):1146-51. //// Kulkarni KM, Pasol J,	We obtained signed statement from the patient's parents We controlled and fixed grammer, punctuation and spelling mistakes Figure 4a and 4b corrected as your comment. We add differantiating between true and false papilledeme OCT informations in discussion We checked references Thank you for great comments



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Rosa PR, Lam BL. Differentiating mild papilledema and buried optic nerve head drusen using spectral domain optical coherence tomography. Ophthalmology. 2014 Apr;121(4):959-63.) 6. All references should be checked and should be corrected according to instructions of the journal. Ethical issue: The authors should obtain a signed statement from the patient's parents.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		