



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_8250
Title of the Manuscript:	Ocular manifestations in HIV/AIDS- Prevalence in South India
Type of the Article	Original 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Line 53: It is very important to state who approved the protocol for the study. Please mention the institutional ethics committee of which institution? 2. Line 65: Authors should describe the type of questions covered in the questionnaire. How were the responses in the questionnaire applied in the study? 3. Line 100: Age distribution is not shown in table 1. Please confirm. 4. Line 113: A study of this nature will benefit from possible explanation of trends observed. For instance, authors should offer possible reasons for prevalence of HIV related ocular conditions among male patients 5. Line 129: The report will need information on how the diagnoses of all the clinical	Thank you sir! for the suggestions and corrections Revised in the Manuscript as Institutional ethics committee of Siddhartha Medical College, Vijayawada. The questionnaire was approved by the Institute's ethics committee and because of its size it couldnot be included in the study.it was mainly based on the previous history of systemic disease and medical records. Corrected in the manuscript. Explained in the manuscript The diagnosis was made by the first author trained in Medical retina after discussion



SDI Review Form 1.6

	manifestations were made. Who made the diagnoses? How were the diagnoses validated? As is presented, there is no way one can rule out possible error arising from human errors in diagnosis. Line 170: The discussion section did not include description and explanation of trends observed from the study. The manuscript will benefit from authors' discussion on the following trends: Effects of gender on ocular manifestations as in Line 114; Ocular manifestations in different stages of AIDS (Line 123); Why was tuberculosis the only systemic manifestation observed? Authors should also explain under discussion the observed link between CD4 counts and ocular manifestations	with senior professors to rule out individual human errors. Revised in discussion part about gender(Lines:184,185,186) and clinical stages of AIDS(Line 187 to 190) Tuberculosis was found from the medical records and they were on anti tuberculous regimen when they attended the ART Clinic. Relation to CD4 counts was revised in the lines from 197 to 199.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Please define each abbreviation at the first time of introduction in the manuscript. Examples are ART (page 1), HAART (Line 21), PSM (line143) ASM (Line 143). 2. Across the text please use consistent presentation of p-value. Authors are advised to write the numbers out such as p = 0.922 in line 103 instead of P = .992 3. Line 47 in the sentence”..... Where there is paucity in reporting is observed.” Correct typo in the sentence.	Revision done in the manuscript Sir! this is written as per the SDI paper template instructions. Corrected in Line 47.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		