



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b><u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u></b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>2015_BJMMR_16423</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessment of pupil diameters in Pseudoexfoliation syndrome under scotopic, mesopic, photopic and dynamic conditions using infrared pupillometer (Assessment of pupil diameters in Pseudoexfoliation syndrome)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	The study evaluating the pupil measurements of patients with PXS using IR pupillometer integrated within CSO Sirius Corneal Topographer. The results suggest that pupillary light response in patients with PXS significantly deteriorate not only in scotopic and mesopic conditions but in photopic and dynamic conditions as well. It is an interesting study that proves the fact we know from everyday practice.	Before writing this article, we also thought that it will be interesting issue. Thank you for your views and comments.
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	There are several errors in the text (dynamic x dynamic) that need to be corrected	Thank you. I made corrections.
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		In the revised article, it was occurred some line changes due to the addition