



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_54420
Title of the Manuscript:	OCULAR PRESENTATIONS OF SICKLE CELL DISEASE PATIENTS IN A NIGERIAN HOSPITAL
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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>IF Patients' gender and educational status were not found to be determinants of development of refractory error, retinopathy and glaucoma WHY A TABLE? In discussion may be useful divide in a better way results of present study from other results, cited in literature. English language is not very good, as punctuation. Tables may be resumed, too data not useful for results! References are to be more uniform.</p> <p>WHY "Patients were recruited randomly from the paediatric and adult sickle cell clinic over a period of 8 months.? On the basis of phenotype?</p> <p>DISCUSSION : Two patients (7.1%) had increased cup to disc ratio and were tagged glaucoma suspects or RESULTS: while 2(7.1%) had glaucoma? Which other studies to confirm suspect?</p>	<p>Some studies found sex as a determinant of glaucoma but we did not. Level of education of people may affect their awareness/ habit of routine eye checks especially in the developing world with high prevalence of illiteracy. Therefore indirectly predispose them to certain ocular complications. We felt the need to include it as our findings.</p> <p>References and grammatical errors have been corrected</p> <p>All patients attending the SCD clinic had their haemoglobin phenotypes established using haemoglobin electrophoresis.</p> <p>More facts have been added to the discussion and highlighted for your perusal.</p>
Optional/General comments	This work may be useful in this geographic area, but may be better if it could be shorter.	



[SDI 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>	There were no ethical issues for the study. Ethical approval was obtained from the ethics committee of the hospital.