



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> 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? Material & Methods; 1-Which color test was done the first are ther any rest between different color test exams.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2- the sentence 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. 4-Authors are encouraged to include more recent literatures in their manuscript. 5-what was authors unique finding with the few same study result?	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It needed revision	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Table 1 arranged clearly and simple	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gholamhossein Yaghoobi
Department, University & Country	Ophthalmology, Birjand University of Medical Science, Iran