



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_47004
Title of the Manuscript:	Trend analysis of various ocular surgeries performed at University of Port Harcourt Teaching Hospital, Nigeria over a ten-year period
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The authors need to provide a clear definition of "Major" and "Minor" ophthalmic procedures. In what format was the data available in the records? (Paper Vs electronic) Were the surgical procedures listed by name or "number" coded? IRB approval statement is not provided, as well as a statement about ensuring confidentiality of patient records. Ophthalmic records data need to be supported by data on the size of the served (target) population; i.e. the tertiary referral center where the study was conducted serves a certain geographic locale, inhabited by a certain population; these numbers must support the provided numbers of surgeries. As a standalone, the provided numbers are so small for a tertiary referral center.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Major procedures were those that required more consumables and expertise, lasted longer and therefore cost more financially.</li> <li>2. Data was available in paper records and the procedures listed were not coded.</li> <li>3. Highest patients' confidentiality was maintained. IRB not applicable since we only tried to appraise our work without revealing individual patient identity.</li> <li>4. Data size was affected greatly by the frequent interruptions of services by strikes by various categories of staff.</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	References may be increased somewhat.	The references used were to compare our findings with similar environment and we feel the purpose was achieved.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Minor language revision is needed.	Language used was directed at the targeted population

**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