



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_OR_17749
Title of the Manuscript:	A clinical sign for aiding the diagnosis of unilateral orbital fat herniation
Type of the 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 <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	A better quality pair of figure 2 is advised and another picture-pair with the same, everted form as figure 1 also would help to understand the message of the paper.	Unfortunately we do not have any other pictures. We do feel that the proposed pictures do show that the fat prolapse inferiorly is larger on the side (left) without the large superior subconjunctival fat prolapse.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Introduction, line 12-13 ("SFH has been mistaken for Christmas...") and also the first sentence of the discussion require for a reference. Page 1, line 21: please write "diabetes mellitus, hypertension" instead of "diabetes hypertension"	References have been added for these statements This has been corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		