



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/ General Comments	Unfortunately, this reviewer thinks that there is not enough constructive material to warrant publication in this manuscript. The author's case is serious, unhappy and regrettable case but not rare and interesting case. And all mentioned ophthalmologists did their own work, and managed the patient's complication properly. There is some risk involved in every ocular surgery. Of course, as the author's suggestion, the consultation and discussion should be accompanied in the diagnosis and treatment of patients. In the large eye hospital, many ophthalmologists have their own sub-speciality, so they can give a detail medical service to their patients. All-round one ophthalmologist cannot do every ophthalmological procedure. They do their best, but some pitiful case can exist. The authors suggested a valid criticism but this kind of issue don't make the article or paper. This manuscript could not give the interesting scientific issue, and also did not be written on the basis of proper medical knowledge.	"The author's case is serious, unhappy and regrettable case but not rare and interesting case. ". We certainly hope that such an outcome is rare. Before the operations started, none of the dozen ophthalmologists suggested that such a poor outcome would be possible. "And all mentioned ophthalmologists did their own work, and managed the patient's complication properly." One our points are that such policies are not sufficient. We think it should be mandatory that each ophthalmologist communicate with the other ophthalmologists and look for interactions between each ophthalmologist's works. "There is some risk involved in every ocular surgery." A big part of this paper is about pain. None of the dozen ophthalmologists mentioned pain when they discussed the risks. None of their literature mentioned any of the pains that we have presented in this paper. I think it should be drawn to their attention that if things go wrong there will be pain and they should describe what the pain will be like and how it will be treated.