



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_44569
Title of the Manuscript:	DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS AND COMORBIDITY PROFILES IN PATIENTS WITH SENILE CATARACT
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	In abstract, results: one number is not right (pseudo-exfoliation syndrome (12 cases-23 10.1%)), please fix it. 'The cataracts were in the right eye for 56.5% of cases and in the left eye for 43.4% of the cases.' There were no bilateral cases? Line 79, 101, 112: the correct word is 'subcapsular'.  It is a correct description about health status of the examined cataract population. It would be more interesting to find any difference of ratios of co-morbidities compared to a non-cataract population. Is there any significant difference? Do you have such data? Are there literature data according to this question?	Dear reviewer thank you for comments and revision.  The sentences were corrected and coloured in yellow.  There were bilateral cases, but only the eye with less visual acuity before the surgery was included in the study. And this is addressed in the materials and method section.  We agree with your suggestions. An additional study comparing the results with non-cataract patients can be performed. But in this study we don't have any data of non-cataract patients.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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)	(Ethical approval number: 2018-05/50).