



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_7034
Title of the Manuscript:	The Patient's Viewpoint of Cataract and Detached Retina Surgeries
Type of the 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	1. I think the article is too long, there are many repetitions, the chronology is not smooth, and the figure and tables arrangement/ numbering is not consistent (table 3 comes before table 2; 2. Information given in some figure legends come before the text the figure is meant to refer to). 3. In addition the report keeps changing from 1st person to 3rd person. I think the author should indicate (may be in different font style or italics) the portions of the manuscript that he wrote and was referring to the patient in 3rd person. 4. I suggest the paper be represented as a case report highlighting the problems associated with the case and discussing the way forward. 5. The corrections are highlighted in the attached manuscript.	I have removed some of the repetition, straightened out the chronology and omitted the premature reference to figures and tables. I have moved the figures to be near their first reference in the text. But of course, the editor might move the figures or tables if journal policy is to put all figures and/or tables at the top or bottom of pages. In the abstract, figure legends and the first 80 lines of text, third person is used. Then, after I explain why, tell the reader that I am switching to the first person. That's OK by me. I am willing to change the type of study to a case report or a design. I think we should ask our Editor for advice. I made all of the corrections highlighted in the manuscript. Thank you.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I think it is a very welcome idea to have such reports from the patient's perspective especially patients with a scientific background. It should aid the process of understanding patients' symptoms and their relationship with pathological conditions/ diseases/ diagnoses.	Thank you