



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The aim from my own perspective may require modification to incorporate scope of findings . I suggest it could be modified to prevalence and pattern(type) . The introduction was narrowed to include only ARMD, if anything a brief mention of the other types of macula pathologies should be mentioned if not in details but under the groups of pathologies that can affect the macula. There were no data to suggest that the authors aimed at eliciting possible risk factors or behavioural factors among the patients: is it because this is a retrospective study? Then it would be better for the authors to state that health education to minimise risk factors will be based on already established/identified risk factors. The methodology appears rather too concise. If FFA and fundus photography could not be done , did the patients have slit lamp biomicroscopy with retina lenses and indirect ophthalmoscopy done? I think the authors need to elaborate a little further on the examinations done. The pie chart proportion representing others appear rather too large in figs 2&3. I think some of the components can be shown as individual	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	compartments.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The authors should link the various findings in other studies to their own findings and possibly proper reasons for the variation . The discussion was also tailored toward ARMD alone just like the introduction . A mention should also be made of other macular findings among the subjects in this study.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Iyiade Adeseye Ajayi
Department, University & Country	Ophthalmology , Ekiti State University Ado Ekiti, Nigeria