



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_11816
Title of the Manuscript:	Diplopia and strabismus in diabetics (Type II) and non diabetics in Yazd, Iran
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	I read with interest the paper entitled “Diplopia and strabismus in diabetics (Type II) and non diabetics in Yazd, Iran”. There are specific issues related to the experimental and control samples that must be addressed since they may affect the interpretation of the results. The authors wanted to investigate the frequency of diplopia and strabismus in diabetics (Type II) compared to non diabetics patients. The prevalence of diplopia and strabismus in diabetics were below the values of most studies in the literature and,	Thanks for your valuable advice. We Corrected and revised the manuscript according to your options as possible. This study is the result of student thesis of Yazd Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Science. We studied diplopia and strabismus in diabetics (typeII) and surly they are older than non diabetics. On the other hands, due to the low number of cases with diplopia and strabismus in all subjects (16 cases in 3000) for matching the groups based on age we must exclude many of our subjects. So, because of age disagreement, the groups were studied based on age separately (table 2).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	surprisingly did not differ between the groups. The authors explained the results on the basis that glycemic levels in these patients, closely followed in a specialized diabetic clinic, are better controlled than in diabetics from the general population. While this is possible, one must acknowledge that the chosen control group is also inappropriate, since they are non diabetics from an ophthalmologic clinic, with other comorbidities (ocular and systemic) that may influence the outcomes, and not non-diabetic from the general population as it should be expected. Moreover, one may note that the mean ages from the two samples are different (61.04 ± 10.84 vs. 36.32 ± 12.63), which may	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	also influence the prevalence of the two variables investigated. Therefore the patient samples did not include an appropriate spectrum of the disease and no disease. The lack of representative samples prevents the appropriate assessment of the proposed goal – to determine the frequency of diplopia and strabismus in diabetics vs. non diabetics.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		