



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>1: the lack of a control group devaluates the outcome of the results. We don't know if we apply the same research parameters on a none accommodative IOL what outcome would we achieve?</p> <p>2: complicated and confusing sentences (example Line 32-34). Needs language assistance</p> <p>3: contradicting data Line 91 (16 eye) in the discussion line 186 (14 eyes)</p>	<p>1. Yes, you are right, it should be better if we had a control group.</p> <p>2. The mentioned sentence was corrected. Writing was checked again, and language assistance was obtained.</p> <p>3. Yes, the included number of patients was 14, and eyes was 16. The miswritten numbers were corrected.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		