



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_7274
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of the Mollon-Reffin Minimal Colour Vision Test
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 (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	There is a few manuscript which claim the preference of MRMT to other color vision test. This study not fulfil the comparative study among color blind and control groups in spite of acquired disease spectrum. 1-It is better the comparison were among two groups of same condition 2-The total of eye in each groups were how many? 3-severity grading and defect type classification in the patient group. according to which (type of color vision defect, impairment of visual acuity,...). Introduction; The authors' dose not references to other same studies finding or preference of this study to do?	This was not possible. We undertook a pragmatic clinical study to compare the various tests in patients attending our general or neuro-ophthalmic clinics for routine appointments. We have amended the introduction to state this. This has been added to the results. According to the type of colour vision defect. This has been clarified in the subheadings in the results section. We have added details of other MRMT studies to the introduction.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Material & Methods; 1-Which color test was done the first are ther any rest between different color test exams. 2- the scentence in 2.2 Patient population "Patients with confirmed anterior eye disease" change to Patients with confirmed posterior eye disease. 3- The grading and also time to each test was according of which pilot study reference. Results & Discussion 3.1 Study demographics 1-It is logical the participant have the equal sex sample size in each groups. 2-Table 1 demonstrated the main participant groups, there is no need to classified the causal field defect without any indication in discussion or conclusion or different inspection. 3-Put the references of line 274-275 It is well known that the number of errors made on the Ishihara test is not a reliable indicator of defect severity.	The tests were completed in random order in the visually normal group and in a set order for the patient group and with a rest time of 3-5 minutes between each test. This information has been added to the methods. This has been changed. References 23-25 are included for the test descriptions. The groups were independent to each other so had different sex sample sizes for both groups. Table 1 includes reference to visual field deficit and this has been discussed in lines 334-343. References have been added.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	4-Authors are encouraged to include more recent literatures in their manuscript. 5-what was authors unique finding with the few same study result?	Further references have been added. We have clarified this in the conclusions.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It needed revision	The manuscript has been revised according to the reviewer comments.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Table 1 arranged clearly and simple	We have revised the table.