



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_43990
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of 0.1% Nevanac on macular thickness and volume after uncomplicated cataract surgery
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	Introduction, first sentence: 'Small incision phacoemulsification techniques and intraocular lens implantation (IOL) provide better visual results after cataract surgery'. Compare to what? A reference is needed. The literature data about cystoid macular edema are very old, most of at least 8-10 years old. In a topic like this, not referring to ESCRS PREMED study report 1 or 2 is a huge mistake (JCRS 2018), and have to be added with details. Discussion: The data regarding changes in OCT parameters would be interesting in a table, not as a text. I think, you do not observe visual acuity changes during the 4 weeks of the study, regarding the use of the nepafenac; and this is the reason why you do not mention visual acuity data. At least, you have to write about it in the discussion.	1. 'phacoemulsification techniques and intraocular lens implantation (IOL) provide better visual results after cataract surgery' fixed. No reference as it is general information. 2. Reference was made to the ESCRS PREMED 1 study report. 3. OCT parameters were given in table form. 4. We compared the visual acuities of the fourth week of both groups and found a statistically significant increase in both groups. Because of the increase in cataract surgery, it was not evaluated as nevanac effect.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		Thank you so much

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	