

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_86322
Title of the Manuscript:	MODEL EYE PICTURES CAN LAY THE FOUNDATION FOR PICTURES OBSERVED BY PATIENTS HAVING CATARACT SURGERY WHILE SIMULATION
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.journalipri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>The main issues of this study are the sensitivity and specificity of eye model being studied for conclude the result In abstract conclusion section, author state many eye model but in methods section only the Gullstrand's natural eye model</p> <p>So, authors include this information with the revised manuscript</p>																					
Minor REVISION comments	<p>🚩 I have suggested the following point to be improve :</p> <p>1. the title of the figures should be below the figure and figure should have good resolution – so please correct this 2. If you interested to show the response of the give question, distribution table can be constructed with 2 vertical column with required row as below</p> <table><tr><th rowspan="2">Question</th><th colspan="2">Response</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>Frequency (%)</th></tr><tr><td rowspan="4">1 How identical was the simulator video at the start of the operation (clip 1) to the one you saw during the deletion of the cataract lens and when it said, "you may feel it somewhere in the eye?</td><td>1. Different</td><td>13 yes (65%)</td></tr><tr><td>2. Similar</td><td>8 eyes (33%)</td></tr><tr><td>3. Do not know</td><td>1 eye (7%)</td></tr><tr><td>4. Same</td><td>2 eye (14%)</td></tr><tr><td>2.</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table> <p>3. You also stated a clear tile of the table above the table and the table need editing as suggested in above form 4. Spelling, punctuation ,and grammatical errors 5. Incomplete statement such as 70% of patients reported the visual feel of shifting focal components as video cuts and 58%.....?</p>	Question	Response			Frequency (%)	1 How identical was the simulator video at the start of the operation (clip 1) to the one you saw during the deletion of the cataract lens and when it said, "you may feel it somewhere in the eye?	1. Different	13 yes (65%)	2. Similar	8 eyes (33%)	3. Do not know	1 eye (7%)	4. Same	2 eye (14%)	2.			3			
Question	Response																					
		Frequency (%)																				
1 How identical was the simulator video at the start of the operation (clip 1) to the one you saw during the deletion of the cataract lens and when it said, "you may feel it somewhere in the eye?	1. Different	13 yes (65%)																				
	2. Similar	8 eyes (33%)																				
	3. Do not know	1 eye (7%)																				
	4. Same	2 eye (14%)																				
2.																						
3																						
Optional/General comments																						

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?	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p> <p>Yes: since this study is includes 20 patients. This required ethical approval from the known institutional Ethical Review Committee. Please confirm that this study was conducted with the principle of the Declaration of Helsinki, and what type informed consent was obtained from study participant which was approved</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	by the ethics committee in revised manuscript. Please, statements which show the ethical approval will be include in the revised manuscript	
--	--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Melkamu Temeselew Tegegn
Department, University & Country	University of Gondar, College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Ethiopia