



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_26503
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison between ultrasonic pachymetry and the scheimpflug based pentacam for assessment of central corneal thickness in myopic persons of Indian Sikh origin.
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	I have the following concerns about the manuscript titled: "Comparison between ultrasonic pachymetry and the Scheimpflug based Pentacam for assessment of central corneal thickness in myopic persons of Indian Sikh origin". 1. In Introduction section it is worth mention about Dua's layer. 2. In Methodology section there are some missing information. a) Was the examination of CCT performed in the same day, nearly in the same time? What time testing was performed? (The CCT has been shown to increase overnight and return to baseline within 1-2 hours of awakening.) Who performed both examinations? The same single experienced technician or ophthalmologist to avoid operator-dependent errors? b) Pentacam examination - How many readings were performed? Which parts of cornea were taken into account? c) Ultrasonic pachymetry - What was used for anesthesia? How many readings were	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	performed? What was the location of measurements? d) I suggest adding Statistical Methods section and describing: which program was used to analyzed the data? Which tests was done to check the data distribution? How was the data distribution? Which tests were used for establish the correlation coefficient between parameters? Why Pearson correlation coefficient test were done? e) Please calculate the limits of agreement and create Bland - Altman plot to show the degree of agreement between two different measurement methods. f) What was the level of statistical significance? g) Is there possibility to compare the results with a healthy control group? 3. In the Results and Discussion section (page 7, line 4-5), the authors mentioned about a tendency of overestimation of CCT by Pentacam, which test(s) was/were used to show it?	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	4. Please correct the editorial errors, for example: title; in Methodology section page 1 line 3 there should be recorded; Methodology section page 3 line 12 Sikh , ect. 5. In Results and Discussion section I suggest adding table with demographic data (age, sex, visual acuity, etc.)	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Dominika Wróbel-Dudzińska</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Diagnostics and Microsurgery of Glaucoma, Medical University, Lublin, Poland</i>