



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_12067
Title of the Manuscript:	A new method for calculating residual astigmatism produced by toric intraocular lens rotation
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	Your manuscript is very interesting, and I think your method of calculating is very useful. However, I have one minor point to make regarding the manuscript. In line 13, the meaning of the following sentence is unclear. Comparing residual astigmatic powers, the rank orders for each IOL were as follows: 14 100% < 90% < 80% at 5° of rotation, 90% < 100% < 80% at 10° of rotation, and 90% < 80% < 75% 15 < 100% at 15° of rotation. Thus, lower cylinder power IOLs perform better than higher power IOLs 16 when rotated over 5°.	I have explained the meaning of percentage terms in the Methodology. Please take a look at Table3. For example, 17.44(100%IOL) is the minimum and the next is 19.32(90%IOL) at 5° of rotation. 34.42(90%IOL)is the minimum and the next is 34.72(100%IOL) at 10° of rotation. Furthermore, the residual astigmatism of 100%IOL is the minimum from 0° to 5°rotation. After carefully considering the reviewer comment, we feel that we cannot revise the sentence to make it more clearer. Please let us know if you had any specific recommendations on how we can improve this.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		