



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_19236
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Tear Secretion in Thyroid Patients in Relation to the Thyroid Status and Previous I131 Treatment for Thyroid Cancer
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The paper is about the tear secretion of patients with thyroid cancer after I¹³¹ isotope irradiation. The authors found that the tear secretion is lower of the patients than the control group. The raised issue and the results are interesting. However, there are some problems which should be corrected. We know very few facts about the patients from the Methods section. The "thyroid patient" category is too general. The type, stage, duration of the disease should be represented, and also the details of therapy: surgery? L-thyroxin? Chemotherapy? There is no any description of the control group. In the Results section there are too many tables, it is hard to traverse it. It would be better to summarize the results in 2 or 3 tables. In the discussion the authors write "tend to have impair tear secretion" or "tent to have abnormal Schirmer test I values" more times. I think that if there is a significant difference than it should be written, the word "tend" does not mean the same. The discussion implies in some points that the Schirmer I test is abnormal only in patient who received I¹³¹ isotope, however the situation is just the opposite.	I would like to thank the reviewer for his/her substantial comments. A description of the "Thyroid patients" group has been added in the "Material & Methods" section. Also, description of the "control group" has been added as well in the "Material & Methods" section. Number of tables has been reduced as the reviewer suggested. The "tend to have" term has been corrected with the "statistical significant difference" as reviewer recommended In last paragraph of discussion section, the sentence "Furthermore, patients with history of...in relation to the thyroid status (euthyroids and hyperthyroids) has been removed, in order not to imply that



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The main positive result of this study is the lower tear production of the thyroid cancer patients, independently from their thyroid status. There is no explanation suggested for this in the paper. Some help could be found in Cavusoglu et al: Tear Function and Ocular Surface Changes in Multinodular Goiter Patients. Ophthalmologica 2007;221:264-268	Schirmer I test is abnormal only in patient who received I131 isotope Cavusoglu et al explanation has been added to discussion section and also it has been added to the references section
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In References, the reference number 21 is not correct and incomplete. There are some roman numbers at the end of some references for unknown reason.	Reference 21 has been corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		