



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_45220
Title of the Manuscript:	Bidimensional spatial distortion in quadrantanopia depends on the cortical damage and not on the deprived region in the visual field
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	Although well written but it is a case study done on one patient only. So it is not a research article.	According to the guidelines of the journal, <i>case reports</i> describe patient cases which are of particular interest due to their novelty and their potential message for clinical practice. The message of my manuscript is not focused on the clinical practice, but helps understand better the functional network of the retinocortical connections. In addition, papers reporting Case Reports should not exceed 2000 words, 20 references or 5 figures. My manuscript is longer and contains more than 20 references and 5 figures. So, I have selected the option "research article" even though the manuscript describes a single case. It reports, indeed, original empirical data that have not been published anywhere earlier.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Introduction is very long. It should be brief.	The topic is complex, and in my opinion a comprehensive introduction is needed to make methods, results, and especially the discussion section understandable to a broad audience. To be noted that <i>Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</i> is devoted mainly to professionals in Ophthalmology and not to experimental psychologists and to researchers especially accustomed in visual psychophysics. In my opinion shortening the introduction puts at risk the comprehension of what described in the next sections. However, if the reviewer retains mandatory shortening the introduction section to recommend my paper for publication, It will be done.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	NIL	

**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)	