



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_30050
Title of the Manuscript:	FAMILY HISTORY OF GLAUCOMA: A PREDICTIVE FACTOR??
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 (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	I read very carefully the manuscript titled "FAMILY HISTORY OF GLAUCOMA: 1 A PREDICTIVE 2 FACTOR??" . It is a quite interesting text but some points have to be improved or better clarified. 1. It would be very helpful to present the characteristics of the two groups (age, intraocular pressure, central corneal thickness, cup to disk ratio, anterior chamber angle) 2. A clarification should be added to methodology regarding the protocol of the clinical examination • The intraocular pressure was estimated with the tonometer of goldmann? • How was estimated the cup to disk ratio? • Why you have not examined the central corneal thickness? • What about other risk factors for glaucoma??? All these clinical finding are important for the aim of the present study because they may represent confounding factors 3. The statistical strategy has to be improved • Kolmogorov Simonov test haw to be used to determine the normality of the data • Qui square test is not appropriate for this study. Instead pearson coefficient	1.Changes done. Page 5 Anterior chamber angle measurements were not entered in data as our main emphasis was RNFL thickness. 2. additions done page 3 lines 62 and 63 *We did corneal examination just to exclude the patients having any corneal pathologies or opacities as our research was mainly emphasized on the posterior compartment of eye. This is the reason why we did not enter the data of corneal thickness.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(or spearman test) is indicated. I believe that the authors have to precise these points before the decision. I have no other comments to refer	*As this article is mainly focusing on the family history thats why other factors are not included in the discussion. 3. Statistical Correction: both corrections are done on page 4 line no. 77 and 78
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		Thanks for your valuable time and suggestions. I am highly obliged.