



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_5926
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of micronutrients on serum antioxidant status of glaucoma patients: a randomized, placebo-controlled, double-masked pilot study
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	1- Please clarify the antiglaucoma medications used in inclusion criteria. 2- Please clarify the antioxidants excluded in the study. 3-Please clarify the details for SAS software version 9.1 in statistical analysis.	1. The antiglaucomatous medications allowed to be used during the study were only local antiglaucomatous medication which the patients have already used prior to study start. Changes were made in Table 1. 2. We have chosen the antioxidants uric acid, ascorbic acid and tocopherol, since they are important contributors of the serum antioxidant activity. Other antioxidants were not measured in this study to preserve an overview of the results. 3. The reviewer is right. We have clarified the details for SAS software version 9.1 or higher and made changes in the methods section accordingly.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1-More details in discussion is required.	This is a good point. As suggested, we have added more details in the discussion.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1-Some typographical and language errors should be corrected.	The reviewer is right. We have corrected typographical and language errors in the whole manuscript.
---	---	---