



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_OR_17131
Title of the Manuscript:	A prospective study of neuro-cognitive enhancement with carotenoids in elderly adult males with early age related macular degeneration. The ZVF Study Group (FDA IND #78,973)
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	In this manuscript, authors have studied the effects of dietary supplemental carotenoids on the cognitive skills of early AMD patients. The idea is good but unfortunately, the execution has remained very weak. Please, find specific comments below. • With these group sizes it is not possible to make comprehensive and reliable findings. Even more difficult it is to prove that the possible changes would result specifically from the studied dietary supplements. Moreover, cognitive tests alone are not enough for measuring the effects. At least the plasma levels of supplements should be controlled. In addition, if oxidative stress or the antioxidative capacity of dietary supplements became discussed, at least some supportive data should be shown. • Abstract needs clarification with abbreviations opened and explained. • The symptoms of the patients should be reported. In addition, justifications specifying the early state of AMD should be clearly stated, i.e. what were the premises for AMD being regarded as early but not advanced form?	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Ethical statements should be reported.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• Page 2: Age-related macular degeneration has first been abbreviated as “ARM” but from the line 47 onwards, “AMD” is being used. The latter should be preferred already from the beginning. • Page 3, lines 84-85: The sentence containing “MCI” and “AD” should be rewritten. • Page 4, lines 129-133: RBANS is reported to be meant for adults aged 20-89. However, the age range of study people seems to be 54-93 (page 4, line 146). Please, explain. • Age and other characters of study subjects should be presented in Materials and Methods, not in the statistics chapter.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• The authors seem to realize the weaknesses of this study. The "strenghts", unfortunately, do not compensate the defects.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Finland