



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_12365
Title of the Manuscript:	Initial treatment of glaucoma in a rural eye clinic in Cameroon: surgery or medications.
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>)

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)
--	---------------------------	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract In the patients and methods section you list that 66 patients were used in this study, then later state 63 (written as 'sixty tree'). Please clarify. In the results section, it is stated 63 patients are involved, 3 males and 27 females. Please change to reflect correct numbers. Body Methods: Your study numbers don't add up, stating you had 99 to start, 36 dropped out, and leaving 66? Please address to reflect correct number. line 50: This is a high drop out rate in your study, affecting 1/3 of pts. You did address this in the discussion section, but may want to expand on this in the discussion section on the importance of follow up that is needed on patients who have underwent surgery line 61: This is a good definition of success v failure, however, later in the text you reference relative success. This definition needs to be stated here as well. line 76: Please clarify "2 hourly" dosing description line 77: Please clarify "a Tropicamide was given" line 87: States 63 patients were involved, which conflicts with methods numbers. Please make sure this is consistent throughout the manuscript. line 89: I would suggest that the sentence stating the number of patients who underwent surgery within 3 months be moved together with the sentence on line 97 which describes that surgery was indicated on 48 patients in the first visit. line 91. I would suggest you clarify what the NCVA decimal system is or how it correlates to Snellen VA. this may just be me being unfamiliar with this type of measurement. line 94: Please describe how you decided on a target pressure line 97: I would remove comment about ISNT rule, alternatively can define it further for the reader. line 98: Please address this observation. If 48 pts had indications for surgery at initial visit, but only 40 underwent surgery within the first 3 months, what happened to the other 8 patients? Clarification is needed for the reader to understand what happened here. Were they part of the 36 that we're lost to follow up?	Abstract In the patients and methods section you list that 66 patients were used in this study, then later state 63 (written as 'sixty tree'). Please clarify. Response: Sorry it sixty tree Body Methods: Your study numbers don't add up, stating you had 99 to start, 36 dropped out, and leaving 66? Please address to reflect correct number. Response: Sorry it sixty tree line 50: This is a high drop out rate in your study, affecting 1/3 of pts. You did address this in the discussion section, but may want to expand on this in the discussion section on the importance of follow up that is needed on patients who have underwent surgery Response: Thanks we gave some reasons for the dropping out in the discussion: line 156,157,158 ". Some reasons for follow-up drop out were the raining season, farming season and sometimes the lack of careers or no improving in visual acuity." line 61: This is a good definition of success v failure, however, later in the text you reference relative success. This definition needs to be stated here as well. Response: Thanks "relative success was defined as an IOP $\leq$ 20 with adjuvant glaucomatous medications". We added it in the text line 63, 64 line 76: Please clarify "2 hourly" dosing description Thank : we changed"2 hourly" to "one drop six times a day" line 77 line 77: Please clarify "a Tropicamide was given" Thanks: read Tropicamide was dropped line 78 line 87: States 63 patients were involved, which conflicts with methods numbers. Please make sure this is consistent throughout the manuscript. Thank; done line 89: I would suggest that the sentence stating the number of patients who underwent surgery within 3 months be moved together with the sentence on line 97 which describes that surgery was indicated on 48 patients in the first visit. Response :Thanks; done line 100, 101 line 91. I would suggest you clarify what the NCVA decimal system is or how it correlates to Snellen VA. this may just be me being unfamiliar with this type of measurement. Response :Thanks We tested the non corrected visual acuity and we used using The Snellen table. But the results was noted in decimal instate in fraction ; for example 3/10 = 0.3 line 94: Please describe how you decided on a target pressure Response: Thanks; We explained it in the methodology."The mean target IOP was
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	line 101: As stated above, you mention relative success but give no definition of this. Previously you gave definition for global and absolute. Additionally, when presenting these results, I would list absolute success first, as this is the success rate where no additional intervention is needed, so on the spectrum of surgical success, this is first, success with medications next, and with failure being last. line 130: Please address the numbers listed, they do not match previous comments regarding the number of patients who met this requirement. Discussion In addition to the comments made above, I would suggest you present the paragraph in a way that reflects current literature and clinical thinking. You can start with the screening issues, then the treatment issues, then discuss your surgical outcome. This will also make the discussion more readable, in my opinion. line 144: Recommend that you re-arrange this paragraph to discuss risks for rate of failure (melanoderma and young age) then state that is why you used MMC. You can then discuss other papers ideas regarding MMC use, then note your result of endophthalmitis, and when it presented. Also use better sentence structure please. line 156-176. thank you for addressing the follow up issues, complications, and other thoughts here. line 158: note how target IOP was decided as I asked above line 183: These are major limitations and should be noted in the discussion section as well. You did get lower IOPs, which is one of the major modifiable risk factors.	obtained from the mean IOP using the Thierry Zeyen method “ line 97: I would remove comment about ISNT rule, alternatively can define it further for the reader Response; thanks , we removed it from the text line 98: Please address this observation. If 48 pts had indications for surgery at initial visit, but only 40 underwent surgery within the first 3 months, what happened to the other 8 patients? Clarification is needed for the reader to understand what happened here. Were they part of the 36 that we're lost to follow up? Response: Thanks, Our study was retrospective and reviewed medical files for operated patients who completed one year follow- up.. Looking at the indication, we found that 48/63 patients had indications for surgery at initial visit In other hand, looking at the time frame between indication and surgery, we found that 40/63 patients were operated within the first 3 months. line 101: As stated above, you mention relative success but give no definition of this. Previously you gave definition for global and absolute. Additionally, when presenting these results, I would list absolute success first, as this is the success rate where no additional intervention is needed, so on the spectrum of surgical success, this is first, success with medications next, and with failure being last. Response: thanks, done line 130: Please address the numbers listed, they do not match previous comments regarding the number of patients who met this requirement. Response ; Thanks, done Discussion In addition to the comments made above, I would suggest you present the paragraph in a way that reflects current literature and clinical thinking. You can start with the screening issues, then the treatment issues, then discuss your surgical outcome. This will also make the discussion more readable, in my opinion. Response; thanks, done line 156-176. thank you for addressing the follow up issues, complications, and other thoughts here Response: Thanks line 158: note how target IOP was decided as I asked above Response: Thanks; We explained it in the methodology .”The mean target IOP was obtained from the mean IOP using the Thierry Zeyen method “ line 183: These are major limitations and should be noted in the discussion section as well. You did get lower IOPs, which is one of the major modifiable risk factors. Response: thanks, we thought these limitations could be mentioned in the conclusion. We did not get lower IOP
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There were multiple grammatical and spelling errors noted throughout. I will list the line numbers and type of errors. Please also be consistent with the use of decimals versus commas for various numbers throughout the manuscript (i.e. 1.35 vs. 1,35). The following list is not complete, but please reviews entire manuscript for errors. 34, 35: grammar 57: spelling 67: grammar 74: grammar 78: grammar 92: grammar 95: spelling 110: sentence structure doesn't make sense 138: grammar 160: sentence structure	There were multiple grammatical and spelling errors noted throughout. I will list the line numbers and type of errors. Please also be consistent with the use of decimals versus commas for various numbers throughout the manuscript (i.e. 1.35 vs. 1,35). The following list is not complete, but please reviews entire manuscript for errors. 34, 35: grammar 57: spelling 67: grammar 74: grammar 78: grammar 92: grammar 95: spelling 110: sentence structure doesn't make sense 138: grammar 160: sentence structure <i>Response, thanks done</i>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is an extremely important public health issue and this study can help guide further efforts and planning. There are quite a few things that need to be addressed, but the revisions can easily be done	<i>Thanks a lot for your contribution</i>