

Sent on: Nov 24,2021

To: retinaid@yahoo.com

SUBJECT: TOOPHTJ Manuscript Revision Required | BMS-TOOPHTJ-2021-46

Body: **Reference#: BMS-TOOPHTJ-2021-46**

Submission Title: Outcome of Scleral Rupture Primary Management Without Vitrectomy ; Jakarta Eye Trauma Study

Dear Dr. Gilbert Simanjuntak ,

Thank you for submitting to "The Open Ophthalmology Journal". Your manuscript has been reviewed, and it needs revision (comments given below/ attached). You may download the correct manuscript version by [Clicking here](#) . You are encouraged to carefully revise the manuscript,

Close

Email Comments



Our publication policy requires the return of your revised manuscript within **one week** from the date of receipt of this message.

When submitting a revised manuscript for further consideration, please ensure that all the suggested changes are incorporated in the manuscript. Also, highlight or mark up the changes made throughout the manuscript for ease of reference.

The final decision will be taken after the nature of your response letter and revision.

Authors from non-English speaking countries should ensure to have their articles corrected by a native English speaker for any grammatical, stylistic and typographical errors. You may want to avail the English language correction service at Bentham. If so, please write

Close

Email Comments



the English language correction service at Bentham. If so, please write for a quote to the editorial office.

Authors who are native English speakers should ensure that their article has been carefully checked for language, grammar, and style (where appropriate). This is in your interest as it will substantially reduce the time taken for the publication of your article.

***References:** References should be provided exactly in the journals specific format.

Note: Please make sure to submit your revised manuscript through our Journal Management System <https://bentham.manuscriptpoint.com/> otherwise it may face delays in processing.

Close

Email Comments



Reviewer Comments:

Referee 1:

I could not understand a single word in page 7,8, 9 the article must be improved starting from writing a better abstract and going through the article different section

Referee 2 :

What was done in eyes with anterior scleral rupture and vitreous prolapse? No anterior vitrectomy? Do the authors refer "no vitrectomy" to any type of vitrectomy or only to pars plana vitrectomy? Why was vitrectomy not done? Because of lack of instrumentation or as a surgical approach? Do the authors recommend not to perform PPV also if applicable? What was considered as a "lost case"? what were the indications for enucleation / evisceration? (even though no case eventually required primary enucleation / evisceration) The study should be entitled "Short term outcome...." As the follow up was no longer than 2 months I could not understand which time

Close

Email Comments



...mental contusion and surgery (Chen et al., 2011) was associated with a better final outcome. Pages 7-9 ????? Page 10 , second paragraph: "The most common cause of a decreased VA in eye trauma was myopic shift due to lens thickening and anterior chamber hallowing, which recovers spontaneously as time passes." – I doubt if this is indeed the most common cause of decreased VA. If so – refractive correction should have compensated for the refractive error.

Please provide following information.

1- ORCID id of all the authors.

2- Please make a clear declaration of the funding you received (if any) for the purpose of conducting the study with **grant number**.

Close

Email Comments



3- Reveal the source of data and materials mentioned in the manuscript, in support of the findings which will be presented in the following format in the article.

Availability of Data and Materials:

"The data supporting the findings of the article is available in the [Mention repository name] at [Mention URL], reference number [Mention reference number]".

· Authors may deposit their datasets openly to Zenodo Repository, in addition to their own or their institutional archives. For more details please visit <https://openpublichealthjournal.com/availability-of-data-materials.php>

4. Please find the attached STROBE check list and kindly submit filled and signed document along with the revised manuscript

5.-Guideline:

When reporting experiments on animals, authors should indicate whether the

Close

Email Comments



and use of laboratory animals was followed. When reporting experiments on human subjects, authors should indicate whether the procedures followed were in accordance with the ethical standards of the responsible committee on human experimentation (institutional or regional) and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 1983.

This means that the authors must make a clear statement that the laws which apply to them in their own country were followed.

DECLARATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE STANDARDS:

Do the Work report experiments involve human subjects?

YES NO

If Yes, were the reported experiments in accordance with the ethical standards of the committee responsible for human experimentation (institutional and national), and with the *Helsinki Declaration* of 1975, as revised in 2008 (<http://www.wma.net/en/20activities/10ethics/10helsinki/>)?

Email Comments



YES NO

(If Yes, the Assignor must submit a copy of the approval and consent-to-disclose form to Bentham Science by fax or email.)

Do the Work report experiments involve animals?

YES NO

If Yes, were the reported experiments in accordance with the standards set forth in one of below national guidelines and regulations:

- The US National Research Council's ["Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals,"](#)
- The US Public Health Service's ["Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals,"](#) and ["Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals."](#)
- UK : the [Animals \(Scientific Procedures\) Act 1986 Amendment Regulations \(SI 2012/3039\)](#).

Close

Email Comments



- o [European Directive 2010/63/EU](#).

If your study involves human or animal subjects you MUST have obtained ethical approval.

Please state whether Ethical Approval was given, by whom and the relevant Judgement's reference number.

Email Comments



If you have nothing to declare in any of these categories, then this should be stated.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries.

Sincerely,

Ambreen Irshad
Senior Editor
Bentham Open
ambreen@benthamopen.net

Bentham Science is constantly striving to improve its publication practices. If you are not satisfied with any procedure of the processing of your manuscript, then please let us know at the following email address with full details:

Close

Sent on: Jan 18,2022

To: retinaid@yahoo.com

SUBJECT: TOOPHTJ Manuscript Revision Required | BMS-TOOPHTJ-2021-46

Body: Reference#: BMS-TOOPHTJ-2021-46

Submission Title: Outcome of Scleral Rupture Primary Management Without Vitrectomy ; Jakarta Eye Trauma Study

Dear Dr. Gilbert Simanjuntak ,

Thank you for submitting to "The Open Ophthalmology Journal". Your manuscript has been reviewed, and it needs revision (comments given below/ attached). You may download the correct manuscript version by [Clicking here](#) . You are encouraged to carefully revise the manuscript, highlighting the exact changes made.

Our publication policy requires the return of your revised manuscript within **one week** from the date of receipt of this message.

When submitting a revised manuscript for further consideration, please ensure that all the suggested changes are incorporated in the manuscript. Also, highlight or mark up the changes made throughout the manuscript for ease of

Email Comments



The final decision will be taken after the nature of your response letter and revision.

Authors from non-English speaking countries should ensure to have their articles corrected by a native English speaker for any grammatical, stylistic and typographical errors. You may want to avail the English language correction service at Bentham. If so, please write for a quote to the editorial office.

Authors who are native English speakers should ensure that their article has been carefully checked for language, grammar, and style (where appropriate). This is in your interest as it will substantially reduce the time taken for the publication of your article.

***References:** References should be provided exactly in the journals specific format.

Note: Please make sure to submit your revised manuscript through our Journal Management System <https://bentham.manuscriptpoint.com/> otherwise it may face delays in processing.

Reviewer Comments:

Referee 1:

Comment 1 – The authors DID NOT reply to most of the questions asked including if vitreous was not cut even in cases of prolapse in the primary surgery, did they do any kind of anterior vitrectomy (not PPV) or why they did not perform anterior vitrectomy

Email Comments



Comment 2 – no clarification of what the term "cannot be salvaged" means

Comment 3 – I do not see that the title was changed as stated by the authors

Comment 4 – answer not relevant to the question.

Comment 6 – the authors stated that they have revised their manuscript. In fact, they did not change a word in the manuscript (version 17) and they did not refer to the question.

Referee 2:

1. the grammatical errors are still many please revise using professional editing

2. Add the visual acuity results to abstract

3. Introduction: . "In a large study that include" until ", playing/gaming, and others. [1,2,3,4,5] ", this can not be used in introduction but as part of discussion. please remove and re-write the introduction again

Email Comments



4. is Initial and final Visual Acuity (VA) are the same ?? and if you use FVA as abbreviation please write it again in methods

5. did you take a local consent from the ethical committee in the Christian university ?

6. in results organize please, when you talk about vision then everything about vision in same paragraph, Types of eye injury convert to table

7. paragraph "After conjunctival incision and wound exploration, the scleral rupture was seen superiorly (medial or temporal) in 28 (68.3%) patients, and inferiorly (medial or temporal) in 13 (31.7%) patients. Eight patients underwent encircling buckle, as the rupture extended posterior to muscle insertion. Cataract extraction was done in 15 cases. Wound length varied between 2-12 mm and shape of wound was mostly irregular. Wound length significantly correlated with improved final VA ($p < 0.01$, CI 0.009 – 0.015). None of the cases underwent vitrectomy at the time of primary repair. [Figure 1]" is a mix up between methods and results. I suggest in results to start with before surgery findings like time between injury- hospital then intraoperative results the ones you could only see after starting the surgery. your decision of buckling or doing something different remove to methods

8. table 1 is starting with "Hasil Jumlahpasien yang terda" and the whole table is not readable goes further until discussion. Please explain

9. in discussion you wrote "Vitrectomy was still needed " please provide info, how many cases still need to have PPV

10. "ETHICS APPROVAL AND CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE:

Not applicable " why not applicable, you should have obtained the university approval before starting the study ??

