



SDI Review Form 1.6

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_7279
Title of the Manuscript:	The networked analysis of static visual field evaluation: A comparison between Medisoft and Humphrey software systems
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 ~~length~~**', 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

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

SCIENCEDOMAIN international
www.sciencedomain.org



	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>
--	---------------------------	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

Compulsory REVISION comments
SDI Review Form 1.6

	I have some major concerns outlined below: Introduction Highlight what would be the main reason why the software results would differ. For example What are the main differences in normative databases? Methods Describe the sample size/study power calculation. There was no big significant different results. However did the study have enough power? Please describe the sample size calculation criteria. What do the authors consider a clinically significant difference? The authors used very strict exclusion criteria based on false positive and negative results. Please discuss its influence on your findings. Results It does not make sense to compare the agreement of false positive/negative rates between softwares since a very strict inclusion criteria was used. It is not clear whether some statistical analysis were performed for all sample or within each stage group. It seems that 10 subjects per glaucoma stage is not enough to find any statistically significant difference, and therefore such analysis should be interpreted with caution.	We have added further information to the introduction. This study was a feasibility study and therefore did not have a sample size calculation. The results of this study are being used to inform a sample size calculation for a future large scale study. We have referred to this in the discussion as a limitation. Our clinically significant difference was defined as greater than 2dB and this is stated in section 2.6. We disagreed that we used very strict criteria. These criteria are used frequently in previously reported studies and we have referenced this in the manuscript. We felt this was appropriate as these are the same test results and theoretically should be represented identically across both software options if raw data is being imported and re-issued accurately. Analysis was performed for all the sample although some of the figures show differences for each group for added information. The Bland Altman plots clearly show all data points on each plot. We have amended the text to clarify this further.
--	---	---

SDI Review Form 1.6

	Discussion Include a paragraph regarding the study limitations.	We have included a limitations paragraph.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Table 2: specify the meaning of “Y”.	This has been clarified.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		