



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_51271
Title of the Manuscript:	Orbital abscess drainage using intravenous cannula : technique and advantages
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>)



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Materials and Methods and Results are mixed: the first 13 lines of the Results should be put in the Materials and Methods. In the Results are not reported the effects of the treatment on the visual function of the treated patients. These effects are cited only at the end of the Discussion.</p> <p>The method of measurement of the distance separating the abscess from the orbital margin on CT scan images is not clearly showed on fig. 2: where is the arrow that is mentioned in the text? Is the cannula provided with a millimeter scale?</p> <p>Quality of CT scan images is not so good.</p>	The manuscript has been thoroughly modified
Minor REVISION comments	<p>There are many misprints in the text: for example, "Materiels and Methods" instead of "Materials and Methods" (page 1), "duing the study" instead of "during the study" (page 2, first line of the Results), "exophtalmia" instead of "exophthalmia", "ophthalmoplegia" instead of "ophthalmoplegia", "obital" instead of "orbital" (page 4, line 2), "interne/intern rectus muscle" instead of "medial rectus muscle" (page 4, lines 5 and 23), "intern" instead of "internal" (page 5, line 4), "ours surgeons" instead of "our surgeons" (page 5, line 9), "without any aftereffects" instead of "without any aftereffect" (page 5, line 18).</p> <p>Authors list seriousness criteria requiring urgent surgical drainage (page 4): line 2 "there is a collected or extensive subperiostal" mass or abscess should be specified; line 3 "there is an intracranial complication expecially in frontal"brain area should be specified.</p> <p>Page 5, line 19: "...have disappeared with a progressive melt of the intra orbital", mass or abscess should be specified.</p> <p>Page 5, at the end of the Discussion: "The classic aftereffect of this disease is blindness found in of our patients": in how many patients?</p> <p>Page 5, in the Conclusion: "..... a surgical drainage of the affected sinus is required": the term "orbital abscess" should be more appropriate.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Interesting surgical technique, but not well illustrated. Materials and methods and Results are mixed. Ophthalmic results are reported only at the end of the Discussion. English form is not fluent. The quality of figures is not so good.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	