



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_40561
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Central Corneal Thickness using Anterior Segment Optical Coherence Tomography and Ultrasound Pachymetry in patients with open angle glaucoma.
Type of the Article	Original 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	Please clarify setting and certificate approval number	This study was performed with an institutional review board approval and all experiments have been examined and approved by the appropriate ethics committee and have therefore been performed in accordance with the ethical standards laid down in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1- Please clarify inclusion and exclusion criteria in details. 2- More details should be added in materials and methods section regarding assessment of patients and visual acuity. 3- Please more details should be added for AS-OCT measurements. 4- Please clarify the version 15.0 used in statistical analysis in details. 5- Discussion is not sufficient. 6- Conclusion should be condensed	1. Revised 2. Revised 3. Revised 4. Revised 5. Revised 6. Revised
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Some typographical errors should be corrected.	Revised