



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_39991
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical outcomes of Tetraflex accommodative intraocular lens implantation 2 years after cataract surgery for presbyopia
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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data of UCDVA in table 2 are inconsistent with those in text 3.1 and abstract. 2. The data of BCDVA in table 2 are inconsistent with those in text 3.1. 3. The data of SE in table 3 are inconsistent with those in text 3.2. 4. The data of UCNVA in table 3 are inconsistent with those in text 3.1 and abstract. 5. The data of BCNVA in table 3 are inconsistent with those in text 3.1. 6. The data of AA and ACD in table 3 are inconsistent with those in text 3.2, abstract and text conclusion(line196). 7. In text conclusion(line196), "-0.13 D," may be "-1.13D" 8. It is said in results of abstract that "A total of 16 eyes of 14 patients were included". But in table 1, the patient number is different. Also in conclusion in text(line186) the patient and eye numbers are both different. So how many patients and eyes? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The UCDVA values which are in the table are the correct values. Abstract and the text were corrected accordingly. 2. The BCDVA values which are in the table are the correct values. The text was corrected accordingly. 3. The SE values which are in the table are the correct values. The text was corrected accordingly. 4. The UCNVA values which are in the table are the correct values. Abstract and the text was corrected accordingly. 5. The BCNVA values which are in the table are the correct values. The text was corrected accordingly. 6. The AA and ΔACD values which are in the table are the correct values. Abstract, the text, and conclusion was corrected accordingly. 7. Yes it should be -1.13 and now was corrected. 8. It was 16 eyes of 14 patients and was corrected.
Minor REVISION comments	In text conclusion(line216), "The" maybe "They"	Yes, it should be "they" and now is corrected.
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Due to high prevalence of posterior capsular opacification(37.5%) referred in text 3.3, It may be better to mention what kind of material this Tetraflex accommodative intraocular lens be made from, hydrophobic, hydrophilic or others? 2. Comparison with the other eye, either phakic or pseudophakic, if there are any data of them, may be better. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The material of the lens was mentioned in line 207. It was hydrophilic. 2. Unfortunately, we do not have the data.