



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_37363
Title of the Manuscript:	Optical Coherence Tomography (OCT): cataract or pupil size?
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	- Title This title doesn't accurately reflect the content of the paper. It's hard to guess what the author wants to express. - Abstract I presume that "Seventy eight eyes of 156 patients" in Abstract should be "One hundred and fifty-six eyes of 156 patients". In Methods section, the comparison of RNFL and macula thickness between groups should be mentioned. - Methods "The degree of cataract was classified following the Clinical Importance of The Lens Opacities Classification System III (LOCS III) ()" in Methods needs a reference. - In line 74, there is a lack of punctuation behind this sentence "obtained even after myriasis". - Discussion It was stated that "OCT represent a valuable tool in the daily clinical practice. In the past several studies arrived at the conclusion that pupil dilatation influence OCT accuracy, as the manufacturer recommends, especially when pupil size is less than 3 mm." in paragraph 1, authors need to provide the data of pupil size of patients in this study. "Wu et al" should be Wu et al. [15]. Similar cases are not listed one by one. - Tables In table 1, First group and Second group were used, while in table 2, they were Group 1 and Group 1. Please unify the names. It is necessary to use standard three line form in all tables. Table 2 is not needed. - This English manuscript needs language modification and finalization. Ethical Issue: Yes	Noted
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		