



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_37449
Title of the Manuscript:	Is online medical information an option to effective patient counselling?
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	The aim of the study is not clear, especially in the discussion. You have not discussed your results but only gave the information from the literature. In the Method section: - please give the information about the city and the name of the hospital - how did you performed randomisation? - it is not clear why You chose patients with newly diagnosed glaucoma and diabetic retinopathy, moreover there are no info about groups characteristics (visual acuity, intraocular pressure, c/d, visual fields results, glucose and HbA1c level, results of macula OCT...who diagnosed those diseases (doctor or patients by the Internet?)any treatment was prescribed? -You attached to the article questionnaire concerning glaucoma questions, how about diabetes and diabetic retinopathy? -What were the keywords to get suitable information searching in the Internet? -the tables are not clear, what is the score and what do they mean? how can I interpret it? - poor discussion, nothing about Your results	Objective-clear statement included Methods: Name of city-included Randomization-Correction included As this study is regarding improvement if public health knowledge old cases might have some information And clinical data is not included in study treatment was performed according to clinical guidelines Attached questionnaire is a sample questionnaire Fig-2 has key word examples Results and discussion corrected:
Minor REVISION comments	Please correct the editorial errors and grammar. Poor English.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		
---	--	--