



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_8008
Title of the Manuscript:	Eye Movements In Congenital Neurosensorial Deaf subjctcs As Assessed By 2D video-Oculography™
Type of the Article	Short 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	Summary of the study: The authors investigated whether there were differences in eye movements in deaf subjects and normal subjects. Fast eye movement and slow eye movements were compared. Comments: 1. It was not clear why younger subjects were used for the study. Although the complexity of the visual tasks were not described in detail, those subjects younger than 10 years of age may not have been able to fully understand? 2. A recent study by Bottari et al describe a similar study in adults. This study should be cited. Bottari D, Valsecchi M, Pavani F. Prominent reflexive eye-movement orienting associated with deafness. Cogn Neurosci. 2012; 3(1):8-	1- In a study of Netelenbos & Savelsbergh (1991), 6-11 years old hearing impaired children were required to perform a visual localization task. The obtained results were considered reliable. Likewise, in our two recent publications (Aleci et al, Cortex 2012 and Aleci et al, The British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research 2013), particularly demanding (psychophysical) tasks were performed with highly acceptable level of confidence by children of about the same age as the ones recruited in the present experiment. However, before collection of the data, a practice period was preceded so as to make children accustomed to the procedure. This clarification has been added in the manuscript. 2- The study in question has been considered and cited.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	13. 3. Regarding the leftward fast eye movement being statistically more precise in the deaf subjects, the authors suggest that this could be a bias. It is not clear what bias. Bias needs to be explained more in detail. 4. The recording system may not be fast enough to detect fast eye movements using 50 Hz sampling rate. Although the authors described that the findings were not unexpected, it is difficult to conclude that there is no difference between the two groups. 5. The authors defined the exclusion criteria based on impaired visual system. However, because this study is focused on ocular performance, examination of the vestibular system may also be necessary.	3- The possibility that the difference in the leftward FEMs is a bias has been removed. A possible cue for the explanation of this aspect has been advanced. in the paper. 4- This methodological limitation has been reported in the manuscript as follows “[...] the recording system processes eye movements with 50 Hz sampling rate. As suggested by an anonymous reviewer, such a temporal resolution may not be high enough to allow detecting subtle differences between the two samples. 5-Like for the missing assessment of left/right handedness, regrettably I have not collected this information at the time of the preliminary examination of the sample. Since I have not found results on the examination of the vestibular system in the revised literature about visual impairment in deaf children (se for example Armitage et al “Visual Impairment in severe and profound sensorineural deafness”, Arch Dis Child, 1995; 73:53-56” or Stockwell E. “Visual defects in the deaf child”, JAMA Arch Ophthalmol, 1952; 48: 428-432) or deaf adults (Bottari et al “Prominent reflexive eye-movement orienting associated with deafness.” Cognitive Neuroscience. 2012; 3:8-13), I have erroneously not considered this aspect as a material point. The flaw has been highlighted in the manuscript.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	6. Statistical analysis is not explained in detail. Matt-Withney U test? Is this Mann-Whitney U test instead?	6- The misprint has been corrected in the text.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Tables: Matt-Withney U should be changed to Mann-Whitney U test.	The misprint has been corrected in the tables.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The results are explained concisely. However, there are many small errors and uncertainties that make this manuscript premature.	I will appreciate, naturally, any further suggestion useful to make the study mature and worth for publication.