



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_7008
Title of the Manuscript:	Multimodal Views of the Human Retina
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	I suggest to rewrite the Abstract because to state the "...results are neatly organized in Figures 3 and 4" is not informative enough for the readers	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Again, I would like to stress a more detailed description of the results in the text, and not only referring to Figures and tables for the results. I know it saves place but at the same time makes reading more difficult. If one leaves to the reader extracting information from the above sources, they might not read the same for someone with a different background than to those who wrote the paper.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is a very good paper to my opinion. I little controversial, because the results are based on one person's long term diagnostic examination and subjective reports. Scientifically nothing is new in the paper, at the same time it clearly shows that modern diagnostic devices are often less useful than the regular conversation and consultation with the patient. It will have a wide readership among the ophthalmologists and optometrists (I hope). It is less informative for scientists, but is still a worthy reading.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer