



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_7073
Title of the Manuscript:	Perimetry comparisons for Octopus G Top and Dynamic programmes versus Humphrey 24-2 SITA fast and SITA standard programmes
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	The authors suggested a good hypothesis. However, this reviewer recommends that the authors should make a more detailed discussion for applying their results to clinical situation. That is, how can we use and consider their results in clinical situation? Please clarify this point in discussion part.	A further paragraph with consideration of results for clinical situations has been added to the end of the Results and Discussion section.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please specify the program and statistical method for statistical analysis in the method part.	The statistical tests and programmes (SPSS or Graphpad) have been stated in the Methods section.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This reviewer thinks that there is enough constructive material to warrant publication in this manuscript. Indeed, in the diagnosis of glaucoma, it is important to know the characteristics of perimetry and interpret the examination outcome. The author's work shows inter-perimetry difference, and suggests us to attention when interpreting the result outcome. Also this reviewer appreciates the experimental design and what the authors report here. Therefore, this reviewer thinks that the author's work is worth for encouraging the reader to peruse this study.	Thank you.