



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal</u>
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 <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	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	Q1. The reviewer is right and the manuscript is again revised by proof reading agency Q2. I really could not find any reference about corneal reflex value. Q3.the reviewer is right but the sentence is ‘ by non-ophthalmologist’ non-ophthalmologists can not use autorefractors. Q4.The reviewer is right and the product name is corrected Q5. The reviewer is right and 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. is corrected Q6. Thanks to the reviewer that MTI can be found commercially in internet, but the reviewer is right and I added the other new screeners spot and 2win.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	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 measurements 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.	Q7. Also I mentioned the previous version of I-screen then I have learned that the new one does not need advanced experience. Q8. All refractive measurements done both dilated and non dilated. Q9. I added also REBIScan Q10. I added the amblyopia risk factors for the discussion part as anisometropia (> 1.50 D spherical or cylindrical), hyperopia (> 3.50 D in any meridian), astigmatism (> 1.5 D at 90° or 180° and > 1.0 D in oblique axis), and myopia (> 3.00 D in any meridian) and strabismus are amblyogenic risk factors according to AAPOS. Q11. Thanks to the reviewer for kind support.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		