



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_28850
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY ON AMSLER'S GRID IN ACQUIRED MACULAR DISORDERS
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	This study contains useful and interesting material that needs to be corrected and supplemented. Summary which has been written as part of the abstract is generalized and does not represent the results. Aim of this study should go before 'methods and materials' and is to be reformulated (it has is not been written as an aim). Introduction section is very short and practically only contains the definition and thus it is necessary that the authors not only add additional medical information but data from other literature as well. Information from 'Amsler's grid' to the section on materials and methods should be moved to the introduction. Materials and methods are well written but may contain too many details and as such would be useful only if it is published as part of an editorial paper (review) and not as an original research article. Seeing that there is only a limited number of papers on this matter, it would be pity if any data was to be excluded. Results have been presented well, both graphically and textually. Authors noted that their study isn't a comparative one but it would have been better if it had been. A comparative table would allow for a comparison between visual acuity and Amslers' grid; and the Amslers' grid both within observed groups and with the results obtained from a (macular) computerized visual field.	Thanks for the suggestions for the manuscript. Actually summary should be the reflection of the study and more clearly what is the message from the study, so i added few more things. Aim section, i changed. This moved to the introduction section. This section is already under introduction section not in the materials and methods. This point i added in the summary.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Also, nowhere is it noted that Amslers' grid provides a way in which patients are able to regularly home test themselves thus allowing for better follow-up and management of the disease. References need to be sorted (they are very outdated) and adequately written (according to a chosen citation protocol) e.g. references 10 - 14 need to be looked at in terms of 'structure' i.e. reference '14. Retinal diseases second edition – Pahwa'; etc.	I added the recent references.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>