



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
General Comments: Q1 I still fail to understand the rationale behind the study. Why on earth did the authors find high readings on the corneal reflex (which essentially implies a misaglnment) in emmetropic non-strabismus patients? There has to be some error creeping in. And why the PlusoptixS08 manufactures, purportedly, say that it implies that there is amblyopia defies my understanding of the subject. Based on these rather flimsy grounds as justification, a study is designed is even more intriguing. Having said that, there appears only one possibility why one may still do this study: the idea that anisometropia, may exaggerate or alter clinical angle kappa, which is what is being assessed by the PlusoptixS08. And this altered measurement of the corneal reflex may be mis-construed by the PlusoptixS08 as a misaglnment. This would not have been picked up on the cover tests, and would in all probability be labelled as straight eyed, anisometropic amblyopia. But for this it is very important that the authors, share the refractive data about their subject. This is missing from the manuscript, and the authors should seriously consider adding that while describing their groups. It is strongly advised, that Confidence Intervals, should be quoted in such studies, rather than only p Values. These are far superior to p Values, and all decent statistical software provide them in their display of outcome. Q2 Abstract: 1. Aims: Still mentions that ' how PlusoptixS08 is reliable ', is being tested. Correction in the title, should match with correction in the abstract and the manuscript.	R1: The reviewer is right and this is the question we asked to the company. Why on earth this machine reads high reflex values on normal subjects ? As a Plusoptix S08 user we are very well satisfied with the refractive data, especially astigmatism values and axis values accuracy when compared with the autorefractors. Unfortunately we sometimes have different corneal reflex measurements in absolutely normal and emetropic eyes and on the other hand sometimes we get normal corneal reflex values in anisometropic and strabismic children. corneal reflex (which essentially implies a misaglnment):The reviewer is right and it is true as theoretically but practically it is not. WE asked this question to the manufacturer and they told us that this value does not only mean that this patient has strabismus he may also have amblyopia, this machine can predict this by corneal reflex value. This is why we evaluated this value in normal non strabismic children. The hypothesis of the reviewer is also correct that altered measurement of the corneal reflex may be mis-construed by the PlusoptixS08 as a misaglnment. The final result of our study indicates that Corneal Reflex measurement of Plusoptix S08 is not reliable value and it should not be considered in examination. R2: Reviewer is right and aim is corrected according to the title. Thanks you all for this hard reviewing process.