



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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Introduction: Line 40-42: you state that “drugs” and “ diabetes” with the other factors influence pupil size, however, there is no appropriate reference for “drugs” and “diabetes”.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: Excluding criteria: Did you include/exclude subjects who have retinal or optic pathologies and other ocular pathologies such as glaucoma, ocular surgeries and neuro-psychiatric diseases in XFS or control groups? Please clarify. Were the subjects allowed for 3 minutes to adapt to the lighting condition for the first measurement or all inter measurements?</p> <p>Discussion: Line 111: The reference of 13 is not appropriate. You can use “Altan C, Kaya V, Basarir B, Celik U, Azman E, Akar S, Demirok A, Yilmaz OF. Comparison of 3 pupillometers for determining scotopic pupil diameter. Eur J Ophthalmol. 2012 Apr 23;22(6):904-910” and “Brown SM¹, Bradley JC. Comparison of 2 monocular pupillometers and an autorefractor for measurement of the dark-adapted pupil diameter. J Cataract Refract Surg. 2011 Apr;37(4):660-4.” instead of 12. and 13.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>references. Line 117: the reference of 12 is not appropriate. Line 137: the reference of 21 is not appropriate.</p> <p>Line 147,148:”We did not find studies investigating pupil measurements using IR pupillometer.”??? Did you mean that you did not find studies investigating pupil measurements using IR pupillometer in pseudoexfoliative patients?</p> <p>The manuscript should be reviewed again in respect to grammatical errors.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Line 161: The first sentence may begin with “To our knowledge, this is the first study...” line 273, Table 1, it should be “groups” instead of “group”</p> <p>Table 2: The table shows mean pupil size, therefore the sentence should begin with “Mean pupil size...” and use “mean” in the abstract and the results.</p> <p>While expressing “p” value, the number of digits after comma should be equal.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Raşit Kiliç
Department, University & Country	Medical school, Ahi Evran University, Turkey