



SDI Review Form 1.6

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</a>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_OR_37851  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Detecting Visuoperceptive Defects in Adult Disabled Readers with the TETRA Analyzer™. Pathological Sample and Comparison with Normal Readers |
| 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)  |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | n/a  |  |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <p>-interesting statistical analysis data presented on the use of the TETRA Analyzer to study an adolescent and adult population with dyslexia; although to note, overwhelmingly most of the patients in the study fall within the definition of being an “adolescent”, thus the authors may want to reconsider the title to refrain from being misleading. For example, instead of just “adults” in title, could say “...adolescent and adult...”</p> <p>-line 59: please correct grammar in sentence. Could change to “The great majority of research and attention on developmental dyslexia has been mostly focused...”</p> <p>-line 61: add a “s” to the word “few”</p> <p>-introduction section is very long, and reads like a discussion section. Suggest at minimum to either remove the section following “to summarize the results of that paper” or simply given an overall summary sentence or two of the previous paper.</p> <p>-in Table 2, I would suggest removing the “PAT” section, which I believe appears to be the patients initials</p> <p>-what do the “/” represent in table 2?</p> <p>-not sure necessary to duplicate a table that has already been published in a previous paper (Table 1)</p> <p>-not sure authors should note in abstract results section that a greater portion of patients showed unbalanced binocular sensory interaction if the difference was truly not clinically significant</p> | <p><b>The title has been changed according to the suggestion of the reviewer.</b></p> <p><b>Correction made</b></p> <p><b>Correction made: “few efforts”</b></p> <p><b>The introduction has been shortened by removing the section following “to summarize the results of that paper..” according to the suggestion of the reviewer</b></p> <p><b>PAT section has been removed</b></p> <p><b>“/” represents emmetropy. “/” has been changed as “emm”</b></p> <p><b>The table 1 has been reported for sake of clarity and convenience of the reader. However, if the reviewer believes it is better to remove it, I will act immediately</b></p> <p><b>The correspondent part of the abstract has been removed.</b></p> |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | n/a  |  |