

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_101399
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical outcomes of surgery for age-related cataract with intraocular lens implantation in two hospitals in north-central Nigeria
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:

<https://www.journalor.com/index.php/OR/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>May be the surgeons working in remote places with limited resources</p> <p>Add available intraocular lens implantation in the title</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Needs many modifications to highlight the points</p> <p>Many areas, it is lacking in proper documentation</p> <p>yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Extensive language and grammatical corrections are required</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is very difficult to accept that biometry was performed in 54% cases and correct IOL was implanted only in 24% cases , but still visual outcome was good in 36.8 % cases. Post operative refraction was performed only in 7 cases and only 5 cases were prescribed glasses .</p> <p>Can not understand that variability in IOL power ranging from 18 to 24 dioptre , randomly implanted can give good visual outcome without glasses ?</p> <p>Another query is post operative astigmatism which was ranged from -6 to +4.5 D , very wide range , How can this range gives good visual outcome ?</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shreya Thatte
Department, University & Country	Sri Aurobindo Medical College and PG Institute, India