

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_OR_106985</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Influence of Horizontal Corneal Diameter on Corneal Tomography and Belin/Ambrósio Enhanced Ectasia Display of Pentacam Corneal Tomography</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. It's about an important topic than can help the ophthalmologists to improve their practices.</p> <p>2. The title is according to the topic.</p> <p>3. The abstract is correct a well-structured.</p> <p>4. The manuscript is well structured, with specific subsections, but I suggest that the introduction should be expanded a little and other aspects related to the importance of corneal diameter measurement should be explained.</p> <p>5. Scientifically, the manuscript is correct, with technical scientific language that allows understanding of the results and discussion. Precise measurements and values were used for the type of study described in the methodology.</p> <p>6. Only the 31.2% of the references corresponds to the last 5 years. The references are outdated.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes, it is.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The article is accurate and provides important information, but I suggest that the authors review the bibliographical references, which are not up to date and, in my opinion, are not sufficient.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Damaris Hodelin Fuentes</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>General Hospital "Dr. Juan Bruno Zayas Alfonso", Cuba</b>