



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_7042
Title of the Manuscript:	Surgical outcome of exotropic patients' management; one year follow-up
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	1. What is the study type, design? Methodology should be clear. 2. Please mention who evaluate the patients pre operatively (orthoptic workup) and who plan the surgery. Also it is important to know if the surgeries are done by the same surgeon. 3. In abstract-results : please mention the % of infants(6 months-2 years) 4. In introduction: please move lines 3-6 to be a starting paragraph. 5. Results Line 12 : Figure 1 shows frequencies of different causes of XT, can elaborate more in the infantile type? In relation to refraction or other pathologies. 6. Results: frequencies of refractive errors why astigmatism is divided in myopic/hyperopic and astigmatism? What is the third one? (table 2) 7. Results what was the aetiology of the monocular extropia? Their ages? 8. Results (diplopia in 6 cases) are they adults? Was diplopia checked preoperatively (prism test measurements or the patients were over/under corrected? 9. Results: total complications rate? Is success rate including overall or after one surgery? 10. Discussion: please comment on: why exotropia is more in males in this study in	We revised the manuscript according to the reviewer options. Changes highlighted with yellow color.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	other studies showed females are more affected? Please rewrite the first paragraph in discussion. 11. Refractive errors same as comment 5, why there is differences from other studies? 12. Discussion: (we found alternate exotropia as the most frequent) please bring this sentence earlier in the discussion. The information about the angles range is better to be added to the results with probably ranging them to mild-moderate and severe or large angle. Furthermore it can be used to divide the patients in their outcomes as per angle of XT. It may be more informative if the under correction is linked to measurements pre-operative if the patient divided in 3 groups and show which one gets more under-correction with used procedure.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Might be better if excluding the cases who had surgery prior to the study and the cases who underwent 2 or 3 surgeries or consider then as a separate group in the outcome analysis. Is the 2 or 3 surgeries needed for correction of the primary exotropia or other surgery complications Questionnaire is better to be called data collection sheet as it is filled by the authors In results: lines 6,7 are there amblyopia or anisometropia?	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Discussion : Chun et al found that medial rectus resection is a successful → can be a start of new paragraph. Also at the end of the same sentence (period.) then erase the word “but” before Yang et al. Noha et al ...etc clearer sentence needed and “After 10 years follow up. But” please change the word “ but” with Another word.	corrected