



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_34947
Title of the Manuscript:	Is the 'visualFields easy' application a useful tool to identify visual field defects in patients who have suffered a stroke?
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	The manuscript is well written and is of interest. Some technical points however, need to be clarified as required in the manuscript, as the researcher needs to demonstrate real understanding of the field testing methodology and convey it to the reader. The new app can help as a bedside tool and also to bridge the gap until the patient is capable of performing a proper field test, however I cannot see it “replacing” the classic field testing.	All reviewer's comments have been agreed or clarified where necessary. Changed in the manuscript and highlighted in yellow. 1. The abstract results, has been updated to clarify which modality produced more false negatives. 2. The abstract results have been reworded to show that with more severe visual field loss, the agreement between the modalities decreased. 3. The limitations of confrontation fields testing have been stated. 4. The manufacturer for the HVF has been specified 5. The advance of the confrontation method being cheap and easily available has been acknowledged. 6. The manufacture of the iPad has been stated. 7. The visual acuity required for inclusion has been confirmed. 8. Question relating to a pause facility in the Ipad application has been addressed 9. Information relating to the onset date of the stroke has been included. 10. An explanation for the higher number of females recruited has been given 11. A copy of the basic visual field report



SDI Review Form 1.6

		graphic printout has been added to figure 1. 12. It has been acknowledged that the HFA checks test points in more depth and on more occasions than the VFE application. 13. The statement relating to self-reported fixation has been removed. 14. An additional statement has been added that the VFE application shouldn't replace standard/classic visual field testing equipment.
Minor REVISION comments	Few spelling and style amendments (see document).	Revisions accepted
Optional/General comments	Very nice and original research. Good effort done.	Thank you