



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_30291
Title of the Manuscript:	ICare Tonometry: Reliability and Validity in Diabetic Patients
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	<p>[1] Last sentence does not “read” properly, i.e. it is not grammatically, as a sentence :</p> <p>Line 332 - High specificity rate of 95% found in control and diabetic central pressures where as specificity of 95% and 89% found in controls and diabetic group for peripheral pressures respectively. (not sure what you mean ...) Please re-word.</p> <p>[2] Line 112 - “DISCUSSION” heading appears to be mis-placed ... it should appear much later, around Line 220, after all the Tables and Figures are shown.</p> <p>[3] The so-called “Bland Altman statistics” are shown as “Plots 1,2,3,4”. These figures should be re-labelled, using conventional Figure #'s, i.e. Figures 4a, 4b, 7a, 7b. Also, this B.A. statistic is basically the same as the more conventional “95% confidence limits”, usual format: [95% CI: a to b (N= #)], which this may be mentioned in the captions.</p> <p>[4] Lines 250 - 255 Figs. 7 & 8. The concept of a special graphing of “Sensitivity and Specificity” is a statistical concept not familiar to most. Suggest a sentence or two of explanation, defining Sensitivity and Specificity, in Materials & Methods, and in Captions 7 & 8, say diabetes =DM and controls = CT.</p> <p>[5] Line 182 - the so-called “ROC Curve” is evidently related to the</p>	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>concept of “Sensitivity” and “Specificity”. Again, suggest a sentence or two of explanation in Materials & Methods please.</p> <p>[6] Strongly suggest including a photo of the new I-Care rebound tonometer, in use, as follows –</p>  <p>[7] the traditional “No Conflict of Interest Statement” saying “The authors have no financial or proprietary conflicts of interest” needs to be included, usually just before the References.</p> <p>[8] approx. 30% of the sentences in this report do not “Read” correctly, i.e. seem to be missing the proper tense, or verb, or object, etc., as if translated from another language. Suggest double-checking each sentence for “continuity” ...</p> <p>[9] If the authors attend to most of these comments, no need to return report here for additional.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Peter R. Greene</i>
Department, University & Country	BGKT Consulting Ltd., Bioengineering, Huntington, New York, USA