



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_49687
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Optic Disc and Vertical Cup Disc Ratio among Glaucoma Suspects in a Black Population
Type of the 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract Methods Line 10: Was GAT used for IOP measurement in addition to the Reichert non-contact tonometer? Explain why not, as the GAT is the only accurate method to measure the IOP, much more accurate than the non-contact tonometer. Lines 81 – 83: These criteria classify the eye as glaucomatous rather than suspect, it is the absence of these signs is what actually makes the diagnosis difficult. The use of both eyes of the same patient introduces a sampling error, only one eye must be included in the data analysis. What was the presenting complaint of the study participants? Or were these recruited as part of the screening program at the study facility? Or were these referred from other physicians? Slit lamp examination is a must for accurate assessment of the anterior segment structures; a pen torch is not enough for such a study.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Non-contact tonometer was used because it was the only one available at the time. 2. Noted and corrected. It should actually read "participants without" and not "with". Line 81 3. Each eye of the subjects was considered in isolation since the study was about individual eyes and not the subjects. 4. They were subjects observed to have only one of the suspicious features as stated. 5. Yes slit lamp examination was done c.f gonioscopy. See line 72.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)	No ethical issues encountered