

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Ophthalmology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRROP_114292
Title of the Manuscript:	Axial length analysis in patients with retinal detachment in New Zealand
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Its importance lays on epidemiological data in New Zeland, as it is already well stablished that myopic eyes (therefore with longer axial length) aare more prone to retinal detachment</p> <p>The title is suitable</p> <p>The abstract summarizes the results found, so yes.</p> <p>Subsections aand structure appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>References are sufficient. As this subject is already well. Stablished, most references date to the early 2000s. I do not have reference suggestions.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	This is a retrospective study, and the main limitation is the high percentage of patients lost to follow up (more than 50%), that could lead to some sort of selection bias. Moreover, it has just a local epidemiologic impact, as the data presented is very intuitive and already collected in several other communities a longtime ago.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leandro Cabral Zacharias
Department, University & Country	HCFMUSP, Brazil