

Review Form 1.7

JournalName:	OphthalmologyResearch:AnInternationalJournal
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_OR_113567
TitleoftheManuscript:	ExploringLipidAbnormalitiesinSenileCataract:ACross-SectionalInvestigation
TypeoftheArticle	OriginalResearchArticle

PART1:ReviewComments

	Reviewer'scomment	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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, perfectly</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No, there is a selection bias in the control cases that may affect the results and thus, the discussion and the conclusions.</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	First of all, I want to congratulate the authors for their work. The structure and language, basically the form of the article, are correct. The design of the study being a case-control study for aetiological analysis is also optimal. But there is a strong bias in the selection of the cases versus the controls. It is not acceptable that, in a study that aims to determine the importance of lipid metabolism in the development of cataract, the cases have a BMI significantly higher than the controls. Also, the number of cases that smoke is remarkably higher than the controls. In the opinion of this reviewer, this error in the design of the selection algorithm affects the reliability of the results. For this, I have to recommend not to publish this paper.	
----------------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alejandra Herranz-Cabarcos
Department, University & Country	Consorci Sanitari Integral Moisès Broggi, Spain