SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	**Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_OR_12365**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Initial treatment of glaucoma in a rural eye clinic in Cameroon: surgery or medications.**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	**Authors' response to final evaluator's comments**
Although the authors insist that they have revised their previous paper, there are still many errors in the revised manuscript. If the authors cannot resolve this issue, I would recommend the authors to use commercial English editing service which would be expected to resolve this issue. For example, even in the revised manuscript (line 12), it is written that 'Sixty tree records (57.14 % (n=3) males'. However, this should be corrected to 'Sixty three records (57.14 % (n=33) males'. In addition, the authors have not include some recommendations which I have suggested to them in the precious report. For example, I have suggested that to include some information regarding the cost benefit of trabeculectomy into the revised manuscript but the authors have not have done so. My final comments are that 'Most of the reviewers do try to improve the quality of the assigned manuscript and to help the readers to easily access the valuable information provided in the paper. Thus, the authors should go through the reviewer's comment completely which in my opinion is a very basic requirement. I have given high overall marks to the original manuscript, but my evaluation for the revised manuscript is disappointing.	**Response : Thanks** English editing service which would be expected will be used **Correction have been made:** **- tree to three** **- n=3 to n= 36** **The** the cost benefit of trabeculectomy have been included into the revised manuscript (table 1 and discussion)