



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 (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	Thank You for permitting me to review this article. I think major revisions are needed. Moreover the discussion lack of focus and the use of English terms seems to me (that I am not mother tongue) very questionable. Tha abstract should be reformulated after the new draft of the manuscript. Paragraph "Introduction": Line 45 : I would change "their macular " in " the macular area". Line 46 : which environment?? Please specify "Matherials" Section: Line 53: please specify the department, nation, city in which the study has been taken. Line 58 : change the "macular" in "the macula area". Please specify inclusion-exclusion criteria. "Results" section: Line 1 : age and sex of the 1008 patients ? You are stating that 42 patients presented with not-specified macular disease, and out of these 29 had ARMD. In figure 1 you are stating that all the 42 had a subtype of ARMD. I think some clarifications are missing. Please control properly Your data, also in	Comments have been addressed in the text. Figure 1 does not say all the 42 patients had subtypes of ARMD but showed that macular disease in this study comprises of dry ARMD, wet ARMD and other causes of maculopathy. ARMD was initially divided into dry and wet maculopathy. Also, i do not agree with the reviewer's comment on line one: .the study is on patients with macular disease and so, age and sex distribution is necessary for the 42 patients only. Also, figure one is on all macular diseases not ARMD alone. Diabetic maculopathy is included in the others. The study was retrospective and there was no indication of the social status of the patients in the case-notes. However, other necessary corrections have been made.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the methods section. I recommend You should clearly divide the patients presenting with ARMD or other forms of macular degeneration (such as myopic mac degeneration, toxoplasmosis, diabetic maculopathy...) Moreover it appears questionable to me that no macular edema secondary to diabetes was found. These 29 patients were smokers ? All the figures should have a more detailed legend. Personally I would add a Figure regarding specifically ocular and systemic co-morbidities of the 29 patients with ARMD, whereas Figure 1 and 2 seem to refer to all the 42 patients with un-specified maculopathy. Discussion paragraph: Line 113 I would delete "high energy" Line 114 : I would change in "the population may need to be better educated about the oral supplementation of carotenoids" .	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		