



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | <u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u> |
| Manuscript Number: | 2015_BJMMR_16423 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Assessment of pupil diameters in Pseudoexfoliation syndrome under scotopic, mesopic, photopic and dynamic conditions using infrared pupillometer (Assessment of pupil diameters in Pseudoexfoliation syndrome) |
| 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 | <p>Introduction: This is concise and to the point. However, it lacks: Pointing out and stressing that PXS is known to be associated with pupil abnormalities The significance of poor pupil dilatation in general, such as the impact on cataract surgery. Suggest adding a few statements (with references) and hence proceed to justify why the study was conducted and give weight and credibility to the aim of the research.</p> <p>Materials and Methods Was the presence/absence of PXS glaucoma a criterion for inclusion/exclusion? Mention clearly, because, obviously eyes with PXS glaucoma, if the glaucoma is advanced enough, would demonstrate an RAPD from optic nerve affection with a sluggish pupil reaction, hence representing a confounding factor for pupil diameter assessment. Was the illumination of the disc in the different conditions (mesopic, photopic and dynamic) by an extrinsic light source, or is this a feature of the machine itself? Please clarify in the manuscript, and how was the desired illumination level quantified to the mentioned levels? (lines 119 – 120 in the discussion, move them here).</p> | <p>Thank you for your comment. We made corrections to the introduction part. It was made corrections about your comments and pointed out with yellow color.</p> <p>It was made corrections about exclusion of PXS glaucoma, IOP and OCT measurements.</p> <p>The machine contains automatic light options. It was mentioned in line 70-74 in the study. Because we mentioned before, we did not repeated in discussion part.</p> |



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>Results: Data (numbers) presented in lines 92 – 96 should be presented in Table 2, omit to avoid duplication. Line 96 – 97 statement is enough including all groups. The succeeding lines 97 – 99 are an unnecessary repetition, omit safely. Line 102: strong between what? This statement needs rephrasing. Table 3 needs much explanation in the discussion, what is the significance of the correlations tested? Discussion: Lines 106 – 111 belong to the introduction, move them there and start discussion by ‘In our study,’ The discussion of the types of pupillometers in lines 125 – 146 is irrelevant to the current study in which the focus is the issue of PXS and its effect on the pupil function. Omit safely. Lines 161 – 163 is a key statement! Move this to the very beginning of the discussion, i.e. start the discussion with this statement. Provide more in depth explanation and correlations of the levels of illumination tested and the effects on IOL function and hence selection, and provide justification to the choice of these conditions, i.e. relate illuminations to daily living tasks and the significance to IOL selection. Overall, the discussion is very deficient. The findings need more elaboration on their importance and significance.</p> | <p>-To avoid duplication, it was omitted lines 92-96. Sentences were simplified.</p> <p>-We defined “p” values in the study to make readers comprehend better. If we omit these values, some readers will not inform sufficiently.</p> <p>-We clarified the sentence as “Correlation analysis revealed strong correlation of pupil diameters in scotopic, mesopic, photopic and dynamic conditions of both PXS and control groups.”</p> <p>Discussion: -We made corrections that you need.</p> <p>-Because it was necessary when evaluating the results of our study, we mentioned other pupillometer devices.</p> <p>-We moved line 161-163 to the beginning of discussion part.</p> <p>- If we mention IOL features with more details, the subject goes off the topic.</p> |
|--|--|---|



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>Conclusion: Lines 179 – 182 belong to the discussion, if at all necessary! Either move to end of discussion, or – better still- omit altogether.</p> | <p>-We attempt to make some additions.</p> <p>Conclusion: -According to your comment, this sentence was moved to the last paragraph of discussion part.</p> |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | <p>The manuscript has poor English language. Consider revision by a professional English language editor.</p> | <p>It was revaluated.</p> |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | <p>This is an original study addressing an important issue which is the pupil function in pseudoexfoliation syndrome (PXS). PXS is a significant problem especially in the white races of Europe and Western community in general, with antecedent complications in cataract surgery. The question of the research is well addressed, and the methodology is well designed to answer the question of the research. However, the manuscript is poorly written and the English language needs significant improvement.</p> | <p>Thank you for your comment. It was revaluated.</p> <p>In the revised article, it was occurred some line changes due to the addition.</p> |