



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_10623
Title of the Manuscript:	Association of the CASQ1 gene SNP rs3838216 with ophthalmopathy in patients with thyroid autoimmunity
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	Comments to the author: The title of the article "Association of the CASQ1 gene SNP rs3838216 with ophthalmopathy in patients with thyroid autoimmunity" indicates that you are concentrating on ophthalmopathy. The aim mentioned in the abstract is directed to autoimmune thyroid diseases at large. Introduction: Page 1 line 24: Reference 8: put between brackets [8] Material and Methods: Clinical subjects: Table (1): You may include the age of the different groups (better as a range and median) in the text and remove from the table to make it less crowded. For the parameters put as mean$\pm$SD, put an * and explain in the foot note. Same for parameters mentioned as No (%), put ** and also explain in a footnote Methodology: You mentioned that SNP rs3838216 [-ggcatt...] is an insertion or deletion. It can't be both. What is the situation in what is supposed to be the wild type? I	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	understand from your data that it might be the absence of the sequence; if this is the case, then it's an insertion. You are using the expression of common Homozygous (both alleles are lacking the sequence) and rare homozygous (both alleles have the sequence). If the expression "wild type" will be used, then, the wild type will replace the common homozygous; the heterozygous has one -ve and one +ve allele and the homozygous will be for those cases with both alleles having the sequence (what you are calling rare homozygous). Results: You have a number of data not shown; I think they will enrich the article unless you have reason to keep these data for the moment, may be for another publication or so. Discussion: Line 176: "which unfortunately was not recorded and it is a": the sentence is lacking the verb "is" Major issue: You are orienting your data and your discussion and even the title as I mentioned in the beginning towards an association of the studied SNP with Ophthalmopathy: In fact GO is not statistically different from other thyroid subtypes; all groups are significantly different from the control. The polymorphism is associated with autoimmune	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	thyroiditis at large but not specifically with ophthalmopathy associated with these cases. This last point is the most important and you have to modify your article, especially the conclusion, accordingly. The article is fine. The methodology is sound and after the major issue mentioned at the end is taken care of, it may be accepted for publication [Comments received from mail]	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Azza Kamel
Department, University & Country	National Cancer Institute, Cairo University, Egypt