



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_44228
Title of the Manuscript:	Visual Function Outcomes in Tinted versus Non Tinted IOLs in Cataract Patients
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	"The mean visual acuity and contrast sensitivity changes in tinted group was more than non tinted groups". OK, but these depends on the preoperative data. Besides, these are nonsignificant changes, as you wrote, so the mentioning is questionable. Introduction: "Manual SICS has been found to be as safe as phacoemulsification with similar visual rehabilitation outcomes" needs for references. Introduction: photoprotection of the blue-filtering is proved in vitro. Please add references. Line 64-65 also requiring references. The describing of the surgical procedure is too detailed. It is meaningless and unnecessary in this paper, i.e., must be significantly shortened. However, in methods, the precise describing of the measurement of the main parameters discussed in this study are completely absent. Visual acuity, contrast sensitivity test and method of colour vision testing are the most important methodology questions. Figures and tables contain the same data (i.e., duplication of data), thus one of these are unnecessary. Discussion: the detailed data of the present population are unnecessary to write again, these are duplications, so the complete discussion must be rewrite. The English is unacceptable and must be improved throughout the manuscript by a professional service.	1.Authors thought mentioning the findings was required. The required changes in the manuscript have been made and highlighted and the part mentioning about the mean visual acuity and contrast change has been modified. 2.References to the suggested lines have now been added and highlighted. 3.The surgical procedure has been shortened and methods describing measurement of Visual Acuity,Contrast sensitivity & Colour vision have been added. 4.Figures and tables have been modified as per suggestions. 5.Duplications have been avoided in the discussion and is rewritten. 6.Professional insight has been taken in the manuscript to the best of our knowledge.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The methods and the presentation of the data have severe issues, the discussion must be completely rewrite. Therefore, I think, a complete new manuscript and a repeated submission would be desirable. The revision of this manuscript, I think, is a much larger work than to write another.	Thank you for your kind recommendations.



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	