SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	**2013_OR_3614**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Reliability and Comparison of Corneal Reflex Measurement with Plusoptix S08 in Nonstrabismic Amblyopic Children**

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:
(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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. **There are numerous spelling and grammar errors that need to be addressed.** 2. **The authors are correct there is no published data, but there has been data presented at meetings that they may wish to reference.** 3. **Line 86-87 – This is not accurate. You can also use acuity screening in verbal children, stereo testing, cross cover testing, VEP testing and autorefractor testing. All of these have published literature discussing them as pediatric vision screening methods.** 4. **Line 100 mentions the Vision Screener, but this is not the name of the product it is called the plusoptiX.** 5. **Line 100 – This is not accurate, the device (as the paper clearly mentions) does not only look for amblyopia risk factors based on refractive error but also will refer children with normal refractive error but who have other risk factors such as moderate-large angle strabismus, cataract, visually significant ptosis, anisocoria, iris colobomas, etc.** 6. **Line 103 mentions available photoscreeners and lists the MTI, but this product is no longer available for purchase. The authors**	

	may want to also mention other photoscreeners such as the Spot and 2WIN. 7. Line 106 – the iScreen does not require "advanced experience" as the company interprets the images themselves. 8. Methods section – All patients had refractive measuments but was this done dilated? This is very important. 9. The authors may want to include a discussion of the REBIScan screener. 10. It needs to be clearly stated what the authors considered to be amblyopia risk factors. I would suggest basing it on the current AAPOS referral criteria which was edited and published earlier this year. 11. Overall I find this to be a very interesting paper and a very important topic. This area has had more attention focused on it recently I feel with some changes this paper will add to the scientific literature. I hope the authors continue to assess their data and do other similar publications answering related questions.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer