



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_7008
Title of the Manuscript:	Multimodal Views of the Human Retina
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	This work is interesting as it assembles multiple data from eight different sources from the same patient followed over a period of 6-years. Unfortunately the clarity of the writing is below average rendering the paper less attractive. The explanation of the nose location (lines 65 and 69) as shown in figure 3 is absolutely not required. Results shown in figure 2 are arguable. Because these are the results of multiple "...experiments over several years..." (line 58), it is not clear what these represent. Is it an average over the many experiments? How does it addresses the evolution of the disease? What is the variation over time? Do visual clues from the right eye influence results? The explanation on section 3.1 is too complex. The statement (Table 2) on the "2 million years ago" for the "Subject-reported vision" is arguable, at least. Likewise, the statement that the slit lamp can evaluate both eyes at the same time, Table 2: "Binocular, can it evaluate BOTH eyes at the same time" - The story on the seven blind describing an elephant (line 221) is inappropriate. Typos: line 76: techniques1 line 130: Ophthal6	Unfortunately the clarity of the writing is below average rendering the paper less attractive. I've edited the whole paper. The explanation of the nose location (lines 65 and 69) as shown in figure 3 is absolutely not required. I have rewritten that sentence. Is it an average over the many experiments? It is more like a consensus. How does it addresses the evolution of the disease? It does not. What is the variation over time? This is chart from 2010.  And I made this one this week.



SDI Review Form 1.6



There are some differences. But they would be hard to quantify.

Do visual clues from the right eye influence results? No, because the right eye is covered.

The explanation on section 3.1 is too complex. I have edited it.

The statement (Table 2) on the “2 million years ago” for the “Subject-reported vision” is arguable, at least.
I have changed it.

Likewise, the statement that the slit lamp can evaluate both eyes at the same time, Table 2: “Binocular, can it evaluate BOTH eyes at the same time” – You are right. I have removed that metric from the table.

The story on the seven blind describing an elephant (line 221) is inappropriate. I have removed it.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Typos: line 76: techniques1 line 130: Ophthal6 Thank you
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		