



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_29833
Title of the Manuscript:	Eye Injury: A Public Health Burden Review
Type of the 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	In abstract, please specify "Victoria"; as I know, it is a state. "Sixty-four per cent of patients were male and 36% were female ($P < 0.001$).\" This ratio does not need p value. The next sentence \"Male patients were most commonly middle-aged compared with female patients who were most commonly middle-aged to elderly ($P < 0.001$).\" needs for numbers.	This has been done. What this is saying is that the difference between the proportion of patients represented by males and that represented by females was statistically significant. I feel this is important, for instance if say the difference was only 3% (52% versus 48%) then it may not be statistically significant. The comparison here of males representing 64% of patients to females representing 36% of patients was at a level of statistical significance.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It is an interesting review worthy for publication.	