



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_OR_17879
Title of the Manuscript:	Peculiar case of orbital emphysema caused by high-pressure water jet
Type of the Article	Case Study

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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- I have read with interest your manuscript. - In abstract, discussion section: Instead of the sentence " This mechanism of injury is most peculiar and to our knowledge,"you should use " This injury is peculiar and has not previously reported in the literature," (the mechanism of injury is not peculiar) (injury is peculiar) (also you discuss this in discussion line 70-71) - In introduction: Instead of the sentence " This mechanism of injury, to our knowledge, has not been reported in literature." You should use " This injury has not been reported in literature" - Line 35: figure b should be revised as figure 1b - Line 40 the medications should be given as active ingredient (not tradename) (augmentin??) - The Conclusion summarizes and interprets the results, addressing the question(s) posed in the hypothesis. But you discuss " Close early follow-up is necessary to watch for any signs of orbital infection following trauma" you should emphasize "infraorbital traumas without globe injuries can cause emphysema" - All of the references should be revised references should follow the reference style (especially 2,4,5,7,8,10,12,13,14,15) You should remove the months from the references.	We would like to thank the reviewer for the comments. - Amended line 21, page 1 - Amended line 106 page 5 - Amended line 43 page 3 - Added line 107. Our case has conjunctiva laceration and commotio, though heals with good recovery, is not without injuries initially. Hence line 107, page 5 is added in place. - All References (especially 2,4,5,7,8,10,12,13,14,15) amended.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		