



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_39323
Title of the Manuscript:	AMETROPIA OF THE CHILD: REVIEW OF 432 FILES
Type of the 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>)

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. The English is not very good 2. Make the objective very clear 3. How were the samples collected 4. Any sample size 5. What are the inclusion and exclusion criteria 6. Ethical approval should have been sought for 7. Was 2 types of data analysis used 8. No graphical representation 9. Tables very few Ethical Issues: it should have been sought for.	All the remarks of the reviewers were taken into account. In the tables of results, the "n" means the number of patients since in the methodology we made it clear that the ametropia was either unilateral or bilateral and concerned a child. The study was approved by the ethics committee of the Medical Society of Congo-Brazzaville. The study was approved by the ethics committee of the Medical Society of Congo-Brazzaville.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		