SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_BJMMR_7518**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The association between near work and ametropia in a population-based study**
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	1. Title needs modification- it is a study of specific group (Medical students) and not whole population. (cannot be declared as population study). 2. Title does not match with the aim or conclusion-The study indicates prevalence of refractive errors and has not investigated the causes/association. 3. Format of Reference no. 16. Should be corrected	
Minor REVISION comments	1. How sample size was derived? 2. Study on medical students only cannot project that near work is associated with refractive errors. Prevalence in general population is required to compare (references required). 3. Other factors like prevalence in family, reading habits and **non use of lenses** (high % in your study) needs to be ruled out before associating the ametropia with near work.	
Optional/General comments	1. Line 181 -growth spot- does it mean growth spurt? 2. Suggested title "Prevalence of refractive errors among medical students in Nigeria"	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer