



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_32631
Title of the Manuscript:	Traumatic Cataract: A Review
Type of the Article	Review 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	The abstract must to be more logically structured and scientific, i.e., first, the definition, second, the epidemiological data, third, the therapy, aims of the review, etc... A complete rewriting of the abstract is required. Introduction chapter: Second reference is not appropriate here. Please add another. "binocular single vision" is not a good phrasing. Lens anatomy chapter: 3,4,5 references are not appropriate here. Please add book references. Concussion as a chapter name is not correct. In this "chapter", 2 references are not in good form. Chemical pathology of traumatic cataract chapter: It is unnecessary detailed, and the references are not good, again. The phrase „concussion cataract" is not used in ophthalmology. Chapter "History of intraocular lens implantation" Was it an aim to write about it in the present review? I believe, not. This chapter is unnecessary. Reference 9 is not complete. The reference list is unexplainable old: the newest is from 2008. Complete change of the references required.	Abstract has been modified and rewritten. I removed this reference. Changed I removed this part. Removed

	If figures are own materials, please add this information. A lot of typing and grammatical error disturb the reading. A professional English proofreading is required. This paper suffers from a lot of structural, scientific, reference and grammatical errors. Complete rewriting of the full paper is necessary. As a very new and significantly improved paper (a new submission), further consideration may be possible.	Removed . I added newer references.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		