



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	1. This is a retrospective study without the use of photographs. This lack of standardization represents a significant deficiency. How do the authors account for this? 2. How was AMD defined? Did all patients with macular atrophy have AMD? 3. Percentages need to be included in the pie charts. 4. Saying that patients are blind is insufficient. Visual acuities should be listed for all patients. 5. What were the other macular diagnoses? And how were these diagnoses made? 6. Did identified patients drink or smoke? 7. Did patients have family histories of macular disease? 8. The Discussion needs to focus on the results of this study, not just rehashing AMD in general. 9. Since this study is done in an "environment" with a black population, the location of the study should be included in the manuscript. 10. Why were the patients blind? 11. What is the authors' definition of low vision? 12. What was the age distribution of patients with AMD? 13. Lines 42 and 43: please give numbers. 14. Line 57: did ophthalmologists perform systemic examinations?	1. There was no facility for fundus photograph during the study period. Yes, being a retrospective study in a place where there is no fundus camera does not mean studies cannot be based on clinical signs. 2. This has been addressed in the text. No all patients with macular atrophy did not have AMD 3. Percentages have been included in the text 4. Done as in table 2 5. Some patients with atrophy in the macular had other conditions like high myopia. the study was retrospective and data was collected from casenotes not patients. Social and family history are subjects of a future prospective study. Other comments have been addressed. lines 83 and and 84 do not infer that ARMD was diagnosed in patients at least as young as 40years. Other scars include myopia, Diabetes Maculopathy, toxoplasmosis and trauma.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	15. How do the authors know that serous macular detachments were not due to another reason? 16. According to lines 83 and 84, macular degeneration was diagnosed in patients at least as young as 40 years. Is this true?	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Fonts need to be consistent throughout the manuscript. 2. What ophthalmoscopy techniques were used? Direct? Indirect? Contact lens?	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		