



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_47792
Title of the Manuscript:	Changes in intraocular pressure and anterior chamber depth after phacoemulsification in non-glaucomatous patients
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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>FOR MATERIAL AND METHODS PLEASE ADD THE FOLLOWINGS:</p> <p>Type and model of Slit Lamp Bimicroscope used in the assessment of the anterior segment depth and the fundus.</p> <p>Type of Visual Acuity measurement (Snellen Chart, Log MAR chart etc).</p> <p>Name and strength (%) of the peribulbar anesthetic used in the surgical technique, (eg xylocaine 1%, lignocaine 2% etc).</p> <p>Name and strength (%) of viscoelastic used during the surgical implant of IOL, (eg Healon (sodium hyaluronate 1%, 4.x10⁶ daltons), Amvisc 1.2% etc).</p> <p>State the location (City/Country) of Assuit University, as this will aid other researchers and medical community world-wide, understand the anatomical disparity in ocular structures, from other cultural and racial groups.</p> <p>FOR THE RESULTS: <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 <i>P</i> values on the authors' guideline.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The abstract truly captured the summary of the work. The methodology was properly elucidated, with parameters clearly measured and findings well documented. The discussion was logical and consistent with previously related work. The tables and figures were self explanatory on the dynamics of postoperative behavior of ACD and IOP over time. The research findings truly met the purpose of the study. This paper was well articulated, technically sound and brilliantly presented.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Umezurike Benedict Chidozie
Department, University & Country	Nigeria