

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_75827
Title of the Manuscript:	New possibilities of refractive modeling of the cornea by the radiation of an argon-fluorine excimer laser
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>The manuscript is poorly written, it is not well structured. The Method section is non organized and does not clarifies enough details. Results section should only focus on the study results. I have attached the file which contains my comments on it.</b>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	Included in the attached file.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	This paper is not focusing on the reported animals. There are some figures of human patients.Are they by any way related to this study? As animals are very difficult to be evaluated by optometrist, how did you measure VA, kerotography and refraction?	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Yes. The researchers claim that written consent was obtained from all patients (Porks and Rabbits)! I think the ethical section was simply copied from another paper and I strongly recommend that the journal check the IRB code.</p> <p>There are lots of information in the paper (e.g. Fig 5) which are clearly related to people not animals and I am worried that they have done the procedures on human eyes before completing the necessary steps.</p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Fateme Alipour</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Iran</i></b>