



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract: Please write "nuclear fragmentation" instead of "nucleofractis".</p> <p>Patients and methods: the type of the phacoemulsification device is not complete: "Bausch & Lomb, Inc." is not enough to identify the device (which kind of Stellaris).</p> <p>Which type of viscoelastic and which type of chopper were used?</p> <p>The power of ultrasound is not mentioned in the case of the divide-and-conquer technique.</p> <p>Please use capitals for nouns throughout the manuscript (for example Stellaris).</p> <p>Line 79-80: "measured in percent-seconds" means the difference of percent and second. I do not think that this is true. Be more precise.</p> <p>A few typing error (for example "Dissapping", "sop and chop") and a lot of space error present in the paper.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	It is a logically structured paper, which strengthens the advantages of chop technique during phacoemulsification in harder nucleus. After addressing the above-mentioned issues, it will be worthy of publication.	

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:	<i>Gabor Nemeth</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Debrecen, Hungary</i>