



SDI Review Form 1.6

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

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	This article demonstrates the effectiveness of trabeculectomy especially in African population. Collecting medical data among patients in the African continent is a challenging task as regular follow-up and ophthalmological examination is limited. I have several recommendations as follow which may improve the quality of this article. 1. Introduction: The authors have mentioned the epidemiology of POAG/glaucoma in the African continent. To the readers, this is an interesting introduction due to scarce literature in this region. However, there are some papers which evaluated the success of glaucoma surgery in African population (e.x. D Yorston, P T Khaw. A randomised trial of the effect of intraoperative 5-FU on the outcome of trabeculectomy in east Africa. <i>Br J Ophthalmol</i> 2001;85:1028-1030). I would recommend the authors to include several previous reports which evaluated the effectiveness of trabeculectomy among African population in the introduction. This will make the introduction more interesting. 2. Methods: In the manuscript it is written that 'Global success of the filtering surgery was defined after one year as an IOP $\leq$ 20 mmHg with or without adjuvant glaucomatous medications. Absolute success was achieved when the IOP was $\leq$ 20 without adjuvant medication. Failure was defined as an IOP higher than 20 mmHg despite topical treatment with anti glaucomatous medication.'. Please provide reference(s) of this definition. If the authors have defined this concept in this manuscript, clear explanation of this	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	concept is mandatory. 3. Methods (line 66) : it is written that ‘All procedures were performed by the same surgeon.’. Please mention the name of this surgeon as abbreviation (e.x. Thomas Cook -> T.C) 4. Results: I would recommend the authors to make a simple table which summarize their results. This simple table will increase the readability of this article to other readers. 5. Discussion: In the discussion, the authors compared their results with other groups’ work and are of a great importance. Moreover, the discussion is interesting to me who had little information about the glaucoma studies which was carried out in the African continent. In the discussion, the authors carefully insist that trabeculectomy (surgery) may be more beneficial than eye drops in selected situation. I totally agree with the authors in this aspect, and to make this article more interesting, I would like to see –approximately- how much (in US dollars) does it cost to perform trabeculectomy in the authors’ clinic and how much does it cost to provide prostaglandin analog s(annually) to the glaucoma patients in the region. This will provide clues and motivations for further studies, such as ‘What is the cost benefit of glaucoma surgery in the African continent?’.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are many grammatical errors and misspells in the manuscript. For example, Sixty tree (line 13), pre operative (line 14), 73,01(line 19), 0,4mg/ml (line 68)... I would recommend the authors to review the manuscript thoroughly and correct all these errors completely.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer