



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_47735
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of structural defects between optic disc and ganglion cell complex in patients with glaucoma
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The title did not quite reflect the purpose. Better if the imaging protocols were added. Eg "Comparison of structural defects between optic disc and ganglion cell complex in patients with glaucoma using HRT and sdOCT respectively.</p> <p>Please use acceptable decimal notation. Use "dot (.) and not comma (,)" for p values and other statistical data. <i>P</i> should always be italicized and capitalized. Zero "0" should not be placed in front of the decimal in P value. Refer to guidelines for reporting P values on the authors guidelines at <a href="http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/23/authors-instruction">www.sciencedomain.org/journal/23/ authors-instruction</a>, for further clarifications.</p> <p>The references should follow the acceptable standard for Science domain journals. Days and months should be deleted where not required. In case of citing from Web resources, the day and month when resources were accessed are indicated, as well as the article's website. Follow the instructions on the author' guidelines.</p> <p>In the conclusion, please explain the significance further in terms of the difference, similarity or agreement.</p>	<p>Thank you for your valuable comments.</p> <p>The modifications have been done accordingly.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Please review and correct some constructions of sentences, punctuations, spellings and grammatical errors.</p> <p>Indicate citations by reference numbers, preferably in bracket [ ] rather than in parentheses ( ) as stated in the authors' guidelines.</p> <p>Please kindly move the Tables and place them inside the text under the Results, preferably after/below the explanations of the result.</p>	Corrected
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>See manuscript</p> <p><b>Red</b> highlights signifies: delete / make corrections</p> <p><b>Green</b> highlights signifies: add / guide to correction</p>	

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>