



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_6364
Title of the Manuscript:	Measurement of intraocular pressure in a porcine ex vivo model eye
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	1-Please identify the place of this article. 2- Please identify the inclusion and exclusion criteria. 3- Some studied did this work , Please mention them and compare with your work.	1 This study was conducted in the IOBA Eye Institute, University of Valladolid (Spain). 2. This is the exclusion criteria: eyes with signs of any trauma, including loss of form, visible retinal detachment, lens dislocation and other, which were verified via direct ophthalmoscopy before performing the experimental measurements, were not used for this study. We have included this description in Material and Method section. Thanks for your comment. 3. We have compared our study with previous ones in discussion, but this study compare the effect of IOP with different cannulation places and no previous studies conduct this calibration. Other studies described different material used tocannulate and measure the pressure, not used the same liquid for infusion, and the density of the liquid can influence the measurement, or included different pressure range. We trust that theres differences are clear in this version of the manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Discussion should be more condensed.	I agree that the discussion can be long, but is a work in very specific circumstances, and it must be clear to change small aspects might not have the same result. We have clarified the discussion, but following reviewer 2 and 3 we can not do a significant reduction of the discussion,
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Some typographical and language errors should be corrected	We apologize these problems, but a professional editor of the company American Journal Experts reviewed the English grammar of this manuscript. But if major mistakes are detected we appreciate your feedback to claim to the company a new revision.