



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_65949
Title of the Manuscript:	Awareness of Glaucoma in Olorunda Local Government Area, Osogbo, Osun State, Nigeria.
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



[SDI 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 write his/her feedback here.)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract and keywords: You should clearly define the aim of this study in Abstract. Remove the word 'causes' as a keyword.</p> <p>Introduction: There is no need to define what awareness is. The importance of Osun State Broadcasting Corporation (because of its great reach) should be mentioned after you list all the places where you organized lectures. You should clearly define the aim of this study at the end of this section.</p> <p>Methodology: Mention ID number of Ethics Committee approval. 'It involved 279 participants interviewed over six months (January to December 2018).' Do you mean twelve months? This is also mentioned in Abstract. More details should be given regarding the questionnaire, e.g. did you use standardized questionnaire and if so, provide the reference; if not, explain how did you decide upon questions. How many questions did the questionnaire have? What were the questions regarding 'knowledge of glaucoma and its treatment', or was it just one question; define everything clearly. It is not clear whether interviewers were present during the filling of the questionnaire by respondents because interviewers' presence could somewhat influence some of the respondents' answers. I think it is the best solution to provide your questionnaire as an appendix. Provide sufficient justification for the use of Chi-square test.</p> <p>Results: Avoid the phrase 'the majority'.</p> <p>Discussion: 'This may account for the high level of awareness in this study and it was scientifically significant (P=0.001). It was the only factor examined that was scientifically significant.' Do you mean 'statistically significant'? 'This difference may however be due to the different definitions...' Provide us with examples of these different definitions so this argument could be validated. 'Although this was not statistically significant, it may be an indication that glaucoma patients and their family members can be used to increase awareness in their neighbourhood.' Change 'be used to' to 'help', so it sounds more appropriate. 'Future programs will have to give health educate the populace about these notions.' Difficult to follow.</p> <p>The discussion should be more thoroughly written, especially regarding the relation that you found to be statistically significant.</p> <p>Provide us with the more precise conclusion of this study.</p> <p>There is no need to write 'Statistically significant' under Table 1, because there is no p-value calculated there. In Table 2, check the percentages for 'Family History of Glaucoma – Present', because they do not match. What does NB mean? It should be specified out of how many participants the sentence</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>'Thirty-nine (20.3%) participants do (should be 'did') not know if any family member has glaucoma.' refers to because 39 out of 279 equals 14.0%.</p> <p>References: The style of citing is inconsistent in this section. When multiple references are cited at a given place in the text, use a hyphen to join the first and last numbers that are inclusive, so ^{14,15,16,17}, ^{21,22,23,24,25} and ^{21,26,27,28} should be abbreviated to ¹⁴⁻¹⁷, ²¹⁻²⁵ and ^{21,26-28}.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Grammar and spelling check, e.g. <i>open-angle</i> instead of <i>open angle</i>, <i>at-risk individuals/people</i> instead of <i>at risk individuals/people</i>, <i>World Glaucoma Association</i> instead of <i>World glaucoma Association</i>, <i>University of Technology</i> instead of <i>University of technology</i>, <i>University</i> instead of <i>Unuversuty</i>, <i>Osogbo Local Government Area</i> instead of <i>Osogbo local Government Area</i>, <i>six months</i> instead of <i>a 6 months period</i>, <i>A multistage sampling method was used to select participants for the study</i> instead of <i>A multistage sampling method was used to select participants into the study</i>, <i>Glaucoma, being a silent disease in the majority of situations needs a high index of suspicion by the populace and all medical personnel in order to pick them early and prevent blindness</i> instead of <i>Glaucoma, being a silent disease in the majority of situations needs a high of index of suspicion by the populace and all medical personnel in order to pick them early and prevent blindness</i>, <i>This difference may however be due to the different definitions used and the many glaucoma awareness programs are done in this environment</i> instead of <i>This difference may however be due to the different definitions used and the many glaucoma awareness programs done in this environment</i>, <i>Although</i> instead of <i>Although</i>, and so on.</p> <p>Numbers from one to nine should be spelt out, except when followed by a measurement unit or when in range, and this rule is inconsistently followed in the manuscript.</p> <p>Once an abbreviation is defined, it should be used onwards, and this rule is inconsistently followed in the manuscript, especially for 'local government' and 'local government areas'.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>It was my pleasure to read and review the manuscript titled 'Awareness of Glaucoma in Olorunda Local Government Area, Osogbo, Osun State, Nigeria'. The manuscript highlights the importance of glaucoma awareness of the general population in Nigeria in order to prevent serious glaucoma consequences, such as blindness. However, this manuscript needs some modifications before its publication.</p>	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Naida Omerović
Department, University & Country	University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina