



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Page 1 line 18 what does alrtered mean? The key-words must be ordered alphabetically! Page 3 line 62 subtenant must be corrected to subtenon. Page 4 line 85 were must be changed to was. Page 4 line 94 Patient must be changed to Patients. Page 6 line 120 %80 must be changed to 80% and %20 to 20%. In the Results section and in Table I 68+48 patients are 116 not 112. There is a mistake in the number of patients, demographics and their percentage to correct. In Page 7 line 150 painor must be corrected to pain or. In page 7 line 151 the concept is not clear and must be written in a more fluent English. In page line 156 have must be changed to has. In page 8 line 191) must be inserted in the text. In page 9 line 206 that's why is correct. In page 10 line 224 English is not fluent and the sentence has no meaning. The References section must be formatted and written according to the Author's guidelines of the Journal.	The key-words ordered alphabetically as recommended. All grammatical errors corrected as recommended. And the references section formatted and written according to the Author's guidelines of the Journal Two mew references were added about LOCS III system and nuclear hardness evaluation.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	None.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	None.	