

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_84857
Title of the Manuscript:	Accuracy of Toric Intraocular Lens Axis Alignment Using Manual Slit Lamp Method and CALLISTO Eye Image-Guided System
Type of the Article	Short 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript appears well written, and so I have only few comments to improve its readability:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Keratometry axis of the two group was different and the incision was all made at 180°, please explain the reason.2. Since there are already several similar studies and reports, to make this article stronger, the authors should state more about the magnitude and importance of this report.3. Please explain how the patients were divided into two group.	<p>We would like to thank the reviewer for the valuable input in improving this manuscript. Listed below are the responses to the reviewer's comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Although we obtained different mean keratometry axis between both groups, the keratometry axis in both groups were within the 'with-the-rule' astigmatism. The main incisions were made at the 0° axis and 180° axis for the left eye and right eye, respectively, to eliminate the surgeon factor and surgical induced astigmatism.2. We have explicitly stated in the digital marking is a costly system which is mostly unaffordable in low resource setting. Therefore, manual marking would be a great alternative that can be applied in low resource setting. Line 40 – 44: “For this reason, manual corneal axis marking using the three-step method is a more cost-effective alternative for determining toric IOL alignment, particularly in low resource setting. This method only requires the use of a slit-lamp biomicroscope and a marker (needle marker, bubble marker, or sterile ink) [6, 7, 9]. Therefore, it has the potential for widespread use, including in low-resources settings.”3. Patient were divided into two group in a consecutive manner, the first patients went to group 1, the second patient went to group 2, the third patient went to group 1 and so forth. This was a blinded process performed by a research assistant. The surgeon did not aware which one went to which group.
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	No ethical issues were identified in this manuscript. This study has received ethical clearance from the Ethics Committee of Universitas Gadjah Mada (KE/FK/0483/EC/2019). All patients have received detailed information regarding the study prior to giving consent to participate in the study.