



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
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>)



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	Title: The title seems it is a comparative study in two groups of surgical versus medical, clear it. Methods: 1-Thirty six patients were excluded from analysis that is one third of sample size and it appear not be logical study. Results: 1-The result needed to convert the main outcome in a table for simplicity and meaningful option. 2-Complication will not be logical as the authors mention the treatment approach unless the cases were unresponsive to medical or Laser treatment option. Discussion: 1-How many patient had cataract before of surgery. Why it was higher versus Bernadin P et al study explain it. 2-Conclusion change according of result as every study will be evaluated among their finding and contribution factor as for example in study in: Curr Opin Ophthalmol. 2014 May;25(3):171-6. doi: 10.1097/ICU.000000000000040. Financial return-on-investment of ophthalmic interventions: a new paradigm. Brown MM, Brown GC, Lieske HB, Lieske PA. or the new surgical approach: ScientificWorldJournal. 2014 Jan 16;2014:469609. doi:	Title: Response; thanks It is not a comparative study Methods: Response: thanks , 36 patients were excluded according to our criteria thus we think the study is logic Results: Response: 1- thanks, done 2- Laser treatment is not available in our clinic. Discussion: 1- Response: thanks, cataract cases reported in this study were those who appeared after the surgery. All cases that were present before the surgery are not considered.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	10.1155/2014/469609. eCollection 2014. Canaloplasty in open-angle glaucoma surgery: a four-year follow-up. Brusini P.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		