



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_50426
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Phaco-Chop and Divide and Conquer Methods in Grade 3-4 Cataract 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>)

**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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- English language needs major editing</li> <li>2- Where are the details of the technique of phaco chop? There is only the machine parameters. (line 72-74)</li> <li>3- EPT is mentioned first without what it stands for. It should be mentioned first.</li> <li>4- In the abstract, the outcomes measured are mentioned as names only yet there is no mention of all of them (except the EPT) in patients and methods.</li> <li>5- There is no mention of how randomization was done to recruit eyes in each group.</li> <li>6- In the evaluating corneal oedema there was no mention of how it was evaluated and even was not mentioned at all. Is it by slit lamp? Why did the authors did not do specular microscopy for the corneas before and after which would have been more objective than just subjectively reporting the oedema.</li> <li>7- In reporting the results of the EPT and PT there is no mention of how they were measured : is it seconds?</li> <li>8- Why follow up time is in days???</li> <li>9- Again in the results section: corneal oedema how was it evaluated??????</li> <li>10- In reporting visual outcomes: what was the measuring method was (log MAR or decimal).</li> </ol> <p>Discussion is do deficient although it is an outdated topic that makes researchers find similar papers.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Engy M Mostafa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sohag University, Egypt</b>