SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal**
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	**2.2. Patient population:** **All patients had acquired vision defects none had congenital defects; the title should reflect this.** **Line 113: "Patients with confirmed anterior eye disease, such as optic nerve atrophy or papilloedema were identified randomly upon clinic attendance and invited to take part in the study." - These are posterior segment diseases**	
Minor REVISION comments	3.1. Study demographics Patients and controls both had more than twice as many females than males. Is there an explanation for this gender bias among the patients? Was the gender ratio in the control group adjusted to match the bias among the patients? Also, the groups were not matched for age, controls being much younger than patients, who appear to have had a geriatric segment. These issues should be discussed. 3.2 Defect detection Lines 194-196 and Fig. 1: Is there a conceivable explanation for the different performance of the MRMT and the Ishihara test for defect detection in right eyes, while their performance was comparable in left eyes? A similar effect seems to have been present in severity agreement (Lines 207-8), while it is reversed for the type of color vision defects. The discussion should attempt to	

	explain these observations. The discussion section actually starts at Line 263; it should get the appropriate heading.	
Optional/General comments	Addresses important issues concerning color vision testing practice, esp. in patients with hydrocephalus and space-occupying intracranial lesions who have visual field defects. Should be published with the above amendments.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Hermann Mucke**
Department, University & Country	**H.M. Pharma Consultancy , Austria**