



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_8622
Title of the Manuscript:	Macular disease in a black population
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors have reported incidence of macular diseases, especially AMD, in their living area. This kind of work is very important to educate people there as the authors suggested. However, I have following concerns about the manuscript. 1. The title of the manuscript misleads readers. This study is not population-based study. The authors have to choose other title representing their work. 2. The authors have repeated "This kind of study is the first in their area or environment". However, they have not described where this study has been carried out in method section. 3. Introduction and Discussion sections are too lengthy to describe general characteristics of AMD. The authors have to describe how their area is different from the western world and how disease prevalence is different from other countries. 4. One of the characteristics in colored people is high incidence of PCV which is one of clinical entities of AMD. You have to analyze the data again to obtain the incidence of PCV in your clinic and discuss about this in Discussion section. 5. Generally, there are numerous grammatical mistakes. I recommend you to ask natives editing English.	All comments addressed in the text. The casenotes did not make any reference to PCV and this is a retrospective study. A future study will look at this.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		