



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
1. Line 2- Purpose is not reflected in the title	Title more reflective of purpose.
2. Line 26- Prevalence to be mentioned	Prevalence mentioned.
3. Line 51- "Corneal scratching" to be replaced by "Corneal scraping"	Done.
4. Line 55- "Sex ratio" to be replaced by a correct terminology	male-to-female
5. Line 57- Words are improper and non-explanatory	Words revides
6. Line 63- Paracentral abcesses are excluded from the study but mentioned in the Results	Paracentral abcesses were included.
7. Line 65- Hypopyon spelt wrong	Hypopyon Corrected.
7. Line 65- Hypopyon spelt wrong	Done.
8. Line 68 to 70- The word "germ" should be replaced by "microorganism" or "pathogen". Fungal and amoebic etiology is not mentioned which is mentioned in Conclusion.	Corneal opacification was meant.
9. Line 75- A standard textbook reference must be given for "corneal flap"	Done.
10. Line 76 to 78 – Observations not explained properly.	Done.
11. Line 79- Replace the word "cold programmed" with proper terminology. Replace "corneal transplantation" by "therapeutic penetrating keratoplasty"	Revised.
12. Line 81,82 – Revise the sentence.	Switched to vision threatening
13. Line 85- Mention specific data comparison	Done
14. Line 86 to 94 – Tables not discussed completely	Done.
15. Line 105 – "Serious abscess" is not a clinical term	Done
16. Line 106 , 107 – Vancomycin and Ceftazidime dosages need to be specific	Done
17. Line 123 to 129- Conclusion needs to be correlated with the results and to be re-written	Done
18. Table 1- 7th risk factor to be clarified	
19. Table 2 – Standard microbiological nomenclature to be followed for organisms	
20. Bibliography- All references should be in "Vancouver" style	