

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_84597
Title of the Manuscript:	Diagnosis, treatment, and outcomes of presumed ocular TB patients attending Central Chest Clinic, Colombo
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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Sample size was not mentioned in the limitations?</li><li>2. Objective visual assessment is a major limitation as mentioned?</li><li>3. Patient experience in assessing visual function is not acceptable?</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.Added as a limitation</li><li>2.Yes. Therefore, it is included as a limitation</li><li>3. We, as the research team is with the same opinion as the reviewer and believe that objective assessment should be available and noted in the clinic records. We have already informed the authorities regarding this major deficiency in the main outpatient centre for chest diseases in Sri Lanka. The visual assessment was only conducted for the patients who complain of no improvement following treatment. This visual assessment is performed at a different centre which is the National Eye Hospital of Sri Lanka. This is a major deficiency in the treatment protocol adopted at Central Chest Clinic, Colombo.</li></ol>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	A good paper though.	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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)	