



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_27302
Title of the Manuscript:	Serum antibodies against mitochondrial enzymes and their flavine adenosine nucleotide (FAD) cofactor in patients with thyroid associated ophthalmopathy
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		We thank the Reviewer for constructive comments, which we have followed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	On page 2 line 20, what is "GH" (should be written before the first abbreviation). Abstract section 'results' should be re-written because it cannot be understood well. On line 28 (abstract), what do you mean with "table 1"? On page 4 line 64-67, I think that you have written a part of your results which should be better taken into the section "discussion". The format of reference should be corrected in references 7-15.	GH is Graves' Hyperthyroidism and is corrected in manuscript line 20 as suggested by reviewer. We have attempted to make our manuscript understandable as suggested. We removed table 1 in abstract section, line 28 as suggested by reviewer. We removed line 64-67 which correctly identified by reviewer to be in discussion and moved it to discussion section lines; 181- 186 of revised manuscript. The format of References corrected in 7-15
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Writing and grammar errors should be corrected especially in "abstract".	We followed reviewer suggestion to the best of our abilities.