



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	1. The English is not very good. Will need good editing.	
Minor REVISION comments	1. No mention was made about ethical approval? What is the ethical approval number? 2. The references are mostly in the 90s. Check for recent references. 3. How did you choose your sample? 4. Conclusion need to be separated from discussion	
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) Ethical approval not mentioned.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tayo Julius Bogunjoko
Department, University & Country	Eye Foundation Hospital, Nigeria

