



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_40049
Title of the Manuscript:	Keratoconus Plus (KC-Plus): A New Term Proposed by an Egyptian Research Team to Treat Keratoconus
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. There is less content in this article, and the narration is not very sufficient. 2. There are few references in this article.	References now are 20.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The logical relationship between the second part and the third part need to be further extension. 2. In the third part, content about refractive surgery and corneal cross-linking need to be updated. 3. The fourth part of the article can give a brief account of the preliminary results in the first three meetings.	The logical relationship between the manuscript parts has been structured in a logical order according to the journal template. The article content and the preliminary results have been added to the manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. The issues concerned are of practical significance. 2. The content of the article needs to be further enriched.	