



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
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	Please see comments. Authors mention about usefulness of amsler chart. It is interesting to read, but there are many problems as a scientific paper. 1) First of all, authors have to read and check Instruction. Please refer http://www.sciencedomain.org/page/general-guideline-for-authors. It is author's duty to write manuscript as instruction recommended. 2) Amsler chart is traditional examination and many physicians have already reported its usefulness (there are many papers and authors have to refer them). So authors have to show something new in this manuscript. I cannot find any new information (This manuscript only shows that" we just use amsler chart for various eye diseases"). 3) If authors want to emphasize their result, I think it is better to explain why amsler grid pattern distribution differ between the disease (please discuss the result from chart 4-7 deeply). In addition, each disease has its severity or grade (type). Amsler chart pattern differ due to severity and it affect result. 4) In introduction part, there are so many information about amsler chart itself. Readers can find such information from manufacture manual. So authors have to write about this information much simple.	1. The manuscript clearly depicts the role of amsler grid especially in settings where higher end techniques are not available and necessitated the role of clinician. By using amsler chart clinician simply demarcate the pathological entities into various subgroups. I simply deleted some of the information from the introduction part. Thought it will be beneficial before performing the test itself.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	And these informations must be included material and methods. 5) Total number of eye is 63. But, detail of 63 eyes is not correct. For example, in abstract part, CRS 22, CSME 24, AMD 6, CME 4 and MH 1. Total is 57, not 63. Similar mistakes are seen in result part. 6) Authors performed this examination at their hospital. I am wondering this is IRB approved study or not. And did they obtain any informed consent? 7) Please show explanation if you use abbreviation. 8) Is there any necessity to show age / sex distribution? Does it have any importance for result? I think it is Ok if simply they show average age and sex distribution with one sentence. 9) Each graph is so colorful and noisy. Please unite just only simple bar graph. And these figures are generally separated from main text. 10) I cannot find most of reference numbers in main text. And format of reference is not correct.	This correction changed and added in the text. This point has been added. All abbreviation deleted and replaced with the full name. Age and sex distribution is showing only the results of our study. References been modified and added.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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>