



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_13618
Title of the Manuscript:	An Evaluation of Computer Based Color Vision Deficiency Test
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Keywords. Delete deuteranopia, protanopia and tritanopia since this is about screening for both anomalous trichromats and dichromats. Instead put in color vision screening</p> <p>Page 1. Their description of the physiology underlying congenital color vision deficiencies is so oversimplified that it is incorrect. "most common color anomalies is due to replacement of one class of color pigment by the class already represented in other cones" is the definition of a dichromat Please revise</p> <p>Page 2. Add acquired to "is the test most often used to diagnose type I, and II red green" it is not clear that they switch from congenital to acquired deficiencies.</p> <p>Page 2. Delete the paragraph starting with "Testing different visual.... It is incomplete in expressing their point (which I not too sure what the point is) and it is not required given the next paragraph</p> <p>Page 3. I think that is grammatical issue, but they state that the examiner "should " be color normal, so my question is, "was the examiner color normal?" However, why should the examiner be color normal? They are just recording the responses as wrong or right.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Please be more specific about the “daylight” lighting conditions for the paper version and the room illumination conditions for the monitor version</p> <p>Page 3. Did the authors make any color adjustments or other image enhancements to the scanned images before saving the final versions and which monitor/settings did they use to evaluate the image quality. I am not familiar with the scanner, but did it have the capability to adjust the color management settings for different monitor settings and if so what was used.</p> <p>Page 3. Which graphics card did they use?</p> <p>Page 3. Were the plates on both tests presented in the same order and what was the order of test presentation?</p> <p>Page 3. Did the examiner actually time the presentations for the paper test or was it just approximately 3 sec</p> <p>Page 4. I don’t believe that the screen was actually calibrated to verify that the color temperature was actually 6500 K. I believe that they mean that the color management system was set to their particular parameters.</p> <p>Page 4. I am uncertain as to whether the paragraph describing the test targets to test the monitor capabilities was actually used as part of the procedure or whether this is a suggestion to the reader to verify that the readers monitor is capable of necessary resolution. If they are describing the latter, then is this should be in the discussion or appendix. They also need to describe the correct appearance of the targets in Figure 2 in more detail in case the reader/printer doesn’t have the required color resolution.</p>	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Page 4. There is general agreement with Birch, 1997 that the responses to the hidden plates can be ignored and just the responses to the vanishing and transformation are considered with more than 3 errors as a failure. The authors should also look at this criterion in their comparison of the two tests to determine whether it affects the specificity and sensitivity.</p> <p>Page 6. Long and tuck should be Long and <u>T</u>uck Nagelanomaloscope should be Nagel anomaloscope Page 8. 3rd paragraph – Reliability wasn't assessed in this paper</p> <p>Page 8. Heskett should be <u>H</u>askett</p> <p>Tables 1 and 2 should be combined into one Table</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>	<p>Well now, we know that the Ishihara printed test can be scanned and presented on a LCD with little color management. For that reason, the paper should be accepted with mostly minor revisions outlined above, many are just editorial</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Canada