



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_42436
Title of the Manuscript:	The Pathogenesis of Index Myopia in Hyperglycemia in Type 2 Diabetes: A Review
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	Please add the links or sources of this review article.	1. Most of the links or sources of this review article, are listed below the references of this article, as an addendum. They were highlighted accordingly in yellow. Lines 794 to 840.
Minor REVISION comments	1- Please add more details regarding differential diagnosis. 2- Please clarify the risk factors of index myopia in percent. 3- Please add a tables or figures representing your aim. 4- Conclusion should be condensed.	1. More details have been added regarding the differential diagnosis, between line 274 and 319, and have been highlighted in yellow. 2. Risk factors of index myopia have been clarified in percent, from line 325 to line 433, and have been highlighted in yellow. 3. Tables were added, representing our aim. An explanation was highlighted between lines 258 and 263 before the addition of table 1 between lines 265 and 267. Another explanation was highlighted between lines 507 and 510, before the addition of table 2 between line 551 and 553. The tables were highlighted in yellow. 4. The conclusion has been condensed as highlighted in yellow, from page 595 to 605. 5. Due to some additions and alterations in the Citations and numbering on this review article, some of the corresponding references have been adjusted accordingly, from lines 717 to 790, and have been highlighted in yellow.
Optional/General comments	Some typographical errors should be corrected	The typographical errors have been checked and corrected extensively.