



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_30713
Title of the Manuscript:	Trends in refractive surgery in Yemen: Consecutive Review of 1933 Cases from a Single Center
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	Introduction Line 1 change 'allover' to 'all over' Change 'since' to 'in' Discussion Paragraph 3, include units for keratometry. For example 48 D Paragraph 5, line 1, change 'done' to 'conducted' Please provide possible explanations for your observations and possible clinical implications. For example, what are the possible explanations and clinical implications of thinner CCT observed in your population?	Changed Changed Added Changed Please update reference number 9 which has been published in Saudi Med J 2014. Yemeni patients have thinner CCT similar to an article published in India (2003). CCT in Egypt and Saudi Arabia is higher than what is found in Yemeni patients with not obvious explanation. The clinical implication of thinner CCT is that less patients are suitable for LASIK and more patients will need surface refractive surgery (PRK) and phakic IOL (ICL) to correct their refractive errors.
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The research question posed by the authors is well defined. The methods are appropriate and well described. The data is sound and the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation. The discussion and conclusions are well balanced and adequately supported by the data. The authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building. Therefore this paper makes a significant contribution to the scientific or clinical literature of vision.	Thanks a lot.
---	--	---------------