



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_29870
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISON OF PHACO ENERGY AND COMPLICATIONS FOR CONVENTIONAL PHACOEMULSIFICATION AND 25-GAUGE PHACOVITRECTOMY SURGERY
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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Classification of the cataract - "classified by slit lamp evaluation according to color of the nucleus and degree of fundus view from Grade 1 to Grade 5". It is a subjective method. I suggest explain better or use the a objective method, such as the Lens Opacity Classification System III (LOCS III). The CDE is associate with the nucleus opacification. Therefore, a methodological error in the classification of opacity, can influence the outcome of the study. Microscopy - I suggest describe the pre and post operative microscopy. Thus, the cornea edema becomes less subjective. If it is not possible these corrections, suggest explain why the discussion of the article. It was a retrospective study and was in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.	Information about the LOCS III system, biomicroscopic classification nuclear hardness which was used in curret study was added. As we did not compared the CDE in terms of nuclear hardness grading level can not influence the outcome of the study. Information about this system and comments about the relation with nuclear hardness and CDE were added in discussion part. Methodological correction and additions were done in which information about corneal examination in each period were done by biomicroscopy and corneal clearance evaluated rather than corneal edema. These were written in material and method part. We clearly wrote that it was a retrospective study and was performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki in material and method part.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	It is a good research, but it could have been more careful in the methodology.	