Dear Dr. Sari,

Thank you for your review of this manuscript. The Editor has decided not to publish this paper.

A copy of the decision letter can be found below.

You can also access your review comments and the decision letter by logging onto Editorial Manager as a Reviewer.

Kind regards,
Trey Kornan
Staff EO Lead
PLOS ONE

---

From: "PLOS ONE: glaucoma@plos.org"
Subject: PLOS ONE Decision: PONE-D-20-38883

Dear Dr. Sari,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to PLOS ONE. After careful consideration, we have decided that your manuscript does not meet our criteria for publication and must therefore be rejected.

Specifically:
The manuscript did not produce sufficient data analysis to provide more in-depth information on the clinical relevance of disc hemorrhages. The details of this are mentioned in additional editor comments below.

I am sorry that we cannot be more positive on this occasion, but hope that you appreciate the reasons for this decision.

Yours sincerely,
Nozomu Sato, MD, PhD
Academic Editor
PLOS ONE

Additional Editor Comments (if provided):
The analysis of the study is too simple. The authors have an abundance of data but just decide to describe the phenotypes of the eyes without seeking associations with other data to see which factors for disc hemorrhages and increased intraocular pressure were identified or not. The authors must provide a more detailed analysis including a description of the study population, and also provide more information on how the data was processed. The data should be included in the manuscript, and the study should be more detailed in the methods section. The authors should also consider including a more detailed analysis of the clinical relevance of disc hemorrhages.

A retrospective study of this kind with an oversimplified analysis does not provide additional information about what is already known. The main question to be answered in this study is whether the LTTH eyes do worse than the NTTH eyes, when IOP is already low? What are the other risk factors apart from IOP?

[Note: HTML markup is below. Please do not edit]

Reviewers' comments

Reviewer's Responses to Questions

Comments to the Author

1. Is the manuscript technically sound, and do the data support the conclusions?

The manuscript must describe a technically sound piece of scientific research with data that supports the conclusions. Experiments must have been conducted rigorously, with appropriate controls, replication, and sample sizes. The conclusions must be drawn appropriately based on the data presented.

Reviewer #1: Yes
Reviewer #2: No

2. Has the statistical analysis been performed appropriately and rigorously?

Reviewer #1: Yes
Reviewer #2: Yes

3. Have the authors made all data underlying the findings in their manuscript fully available?

In order to comply with the policy, authors must make all data underlying the findings described in their manuscript fully available without restriction, with rare exception (please refer to the Data Availability Statement in the manuscript PDF file). The data should be presented in the body of the manuscript or as an attachment if it exceeds 20,000 characters.

Reviewer #1: No
Reviewer #2: No

4. Is the manuscript presented in an intelligible fashion and written in standard English?

PLOS ONE does not copyedit accepted manuscripts, so the language in submitted articles must be clear, correct, and unambiguous. Any typographical or grammatical errors should be corrected at revision, so please note any specific errors here.

Reviewer #1: Yes
Reviewer #2: Yes

5. Review Comments to the Author

Please use the space provided to explain your answers to the questions above. You may also include additional comments for the author, including concerns about dual publication, research ethics, or publication ethics. (Please upload your review as an attachment if it exceeds 20,000 characters)

Reviewer #1: This is a good paper by the authors describe the disc hemorrhage as a risk factor for glaucoma.

Specific comment:

Abstract:
Ideally conclusion should state the clinical implication of study to current practice:

Introduction:

Material and Methods:

1. Type of glaucoma in your sample and its distribution were not mentioned and specified.

2. What tools used to detect the disc hemorrhage?

3. What tools did the author use to detect the disc hemorrhage?

4. The references and reason divided by LTTH and HTDH with IOP <16 mmHg and IOP >16 mmHg

Results:

1. Only describe the characteristic demographic between LTTH and HTDH.
2. Should describe another table to compare between LTDH and HTDH with median (Min-max) and Standard Deviation, so the the significance clearly.

Conclusion
Should make more detail disc haemorrhage as a risk factor for glaucoma specially normal tension glaucoma

Reviewer #2. It is an interesting manuscripts.

I would like to point out some suggestions and quandies:

Methods
1) Regarding IOP of the patients
   - Is it adjusted based on the CCT (central corneal thickness)? since CCT was found to be thinner in LTDH group
   - What was used to measure the IOP? and how many readings and operators?

2) Last sentence in 3rd paragraph under heading of “Participants”
   - What do author means by “whenever both eyes were eligible, one was randomly selected for analysis”? All the ocular data were from the DH eye right?

3) Perhaps author can elaborate more regarding DH recurrence? How many episodes occurred before? And what was the IOP that time?

4) Regarding VF MD index analysis
   - Perhaps author can divide patients into different group base on their glaucoma severity (Using VF MD index) rather than using overall mean MD index to study which group of patients have greater risk of DH. By doing so, author may find out which group of glaucoma patients in LTDH and HTDH will have higher risk to develop DH

5) Suggest author to elaborate on “others” under glaucoma type (HTDH group)? It consist almost quarter of the HTDH patients

6) Was blood pressure measurement done during the DH detection? It will be very useful and may add on information for patients with vascular dysregulation.

thanks

6. PLOS authors have the option to publish the peer review history of their article (what does this mean?) If published, this will include your full peer review and any attached files.

If you choose “no”, your identity will remain anonymous but your review may still be made public.

Do you want your identity to be public for this peer review? For information about this choice, including consent withdrawal, please see our Privacy Policy.

Reviewer #1: No
Reviewer #2: Yes, TANG SENG FAI

(NOTE: If reviewer comments were submitted as an attachment file, they will be attached to this email and accessible via the submission site. Please log into your account, locate the manuscript record, and check for the action link “View Attachments”. If this link does not appear, there are no attachment files.)

------
For journal use only: PONEDEC3
Sent from my phone.

Begin forwarded message:

From: PLOS ONE <em@editorialmanager.com>
Date: 29 January 2021 08:35:51 GMT+7
To: Maritha Dewi Sari <maritha_ds@yahoo.co.id>
Subject: Dr. Norsamsiah Din invites you to review PLOS ONE manuscript PONE-D-20-38683.
[EMID-896d206c2683ae345]
Reply-to: PLOS ONE <plosone@plos.org>

Dear Dr. Sari,

I am writing to invite you to review a manuscript for PLOS ONE entitled “CLINICAL PROFILES OF GLAUCOMATOUS PATIENTS WITH HIGH-AND LOW-TENSION OPTIC DISC HEMORRHAGES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY” (PONE-D-20-38683).

The author list and abstract are appended below, plus more detailed information about PLOS ONE and its editorial criteria. This manuscript is a Research Article.

If you accept this assignment, you are committing to a confidential review process. Reviewers may not share or act upon any confidential information gained in the review process. More information about confidentiality in the review process is available here. You are also confirming that you have no competing interests that may affect your ability to provide an objective evaluation. Our Competing Interests policy can be found here.

Beginning May 22, 2019, authors may choose to make the Peer Review History of their article publicly available on publication. As a result, your peer review form responses and comments may be made public if this manuscript was submitted after May 22nd and the author chooses to opt in to the service. This manuscript was submitted on Dec 18, 2020 09:20AM. If you accept this assignment:

- you acknowledge that we may publish your review under a CC BY license, in accordance with our Terms of Use (https://www.plos.org/terms-of-use)
- you will have the option to consent to have your name disclosed. Providing consent to disclose your name is not a condition to accepting this assignment.
  - if you provide consent, your name will be made public if the author chooses to publish their Peer Review History.
  - if you chose not to provide consent to have your name disclosed, your review may still be made public if the author chooses to publish their Peer Review History and PLOS will continue to use your personal information for other purposes, as described in our Privacy Policy (https://www.plos.org/privacy-policy).

In accordance with the launch of peer review history at PLOS, we have updated our Privacy Policy to inform you, as reviewer, about how PLOS will process your personal information if you consent to disclose your identity and about your right to withdraw consent. The updated Privacy Policy will go into effect May 22, 2019. Please read the updated Privacy Policy.

If you ACCEPT to review this paper, please click the following link: Agree to Review

I would appreciate receiving your review within 10 calendar days of your acceptance.

If you DECLINE to review this paper, please click the following link: Decline to Review
PLOS ONE employs a structured reviewer form to help reviewers focus on our publication criteria. We encourage you to read about the form. You can also visit the PLOS Reviewer Center for peer review guides, tips, and other resources.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact us at plosone@plos.org

With kind regards,
Dr. Norhamisha Md Din
Academic Editor

Title: CLINICAL PROFILES OF GLAUCOMATOUS PATIENTS WITH HIGH- AND LOW-TENSION OPTIC DISC HERMORRHAGES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY
Authors: Izabela Almeida, M.D.; Diego Torres Dias; Paula Azevedo Alhadef, Flavio Silveira Santos Lopes, Carolina P B Gracilieri, Augusto Parenthos Jr., Robert Rich, Tiago Santos Prata

If the article type is not Research Article, please view this page for more information on other article types: https://journals.plos.org/plosone/other-article-types

ABSTRACT:

Background: Optic disc hemorrhage (DH) is an important glaucoma risk factor, and occurs in a wide intraocular pressure (IOP) range. Aims: We sought to characterize distinct clinical subtypes of patients with high-tension (HTDH) and low-tension DHs (LTDH).

Methods: In this cross-sectional study, treated glaucomatous patients with DHs from two Glaucoma Services were consecutively enrolled. Disc photographs were evaluated for the presence of DH by two glaucoma specialists. After inclusion, patients were classified on HTDH (IOP>26mmHg) and LTDH (IOP<16mmHg, median split). Clinical and ocular data from the time of DH detection were compared between groups.

Results: One hundred thirty-three DH patients were included (LTDH=56 eyes, HTDH=67 eyes). Patients with LTDH were more often women than those with HTDH (77% vs 42%, p<0.030). There was also a trend for a higher prevalence of Asian descents (24% vs 9%, p=0.066) and symptoms suggestive of vascular dysregulation (34% vs 14%, p=0.057) in LTDH patients. Eyes with LTDH also had worse visual field (VF) mean deviation index (p=0.037), higher prevalence of normal-tension glaucoma (NTG) diagnosis (45% vs 17%, p=0.001) and tended to have thinner central corneas (p=0.066).

Conclusion: Patients developing DHs with treated IOPs in the low teens seem to more frequently fit in a profile represented by women, NTG diagnosis and greater VF loss. The presence of symptoms suggestive of vascular dysregulation and race also seem to differ between these two clinical subtypes. A closer optic disc surveillance is recommended for patients with the LTDH subtype, as they may develop DHs despite seemingly well-controlled IOP.

About PLOS ONE

PLOS ONE is one of the journals published by the Public Library of Science. Its editorial criteria are very straightforward. PLOS ONE objectively concentrates on the technical aspects of a study rather than the more subjective evaluations (of impact or interest level) used by other journals. In essence, PLOS ONE wishes to publish ANY report of scientific research that will make a valid contribution to the scientific record. The journal encompasses the full breadth of scientific research by publishing, in an Open Access environment, contributions from all areas of science.

To be accepted for publication in PLOS ONE, research articles must satisfy the following criteria:

1. The study presents the results of original research.
2. Results reported have not been published elsewhere.
3. Experiments, statistics, and other analyses are performed to a high technical standard and are described in sufficient detail.
4. Conclusions are presented in an appropriate fashion and are supported by the data.
5. The article is presented in an intelligible fashion and is written in standard English.
6. The research meets all applicable standards for research integrity.
7. The article adheres to appropriate reporting guidelines and community standards for data availability.

Please visit http://www.plosone.org for more information about PLOS ONE.

Trouble with the links?

Please visit http://www.plosone.org for more information about PLOS ONE.

Trouble with the links?

You may also go to the Editorial Manager website directly at https://www.editorialmanager.com/pone/ and log in to accept or decline the assignment. If you do not have your username and password, they can be retrieved by clicking the Send Username/Password link. Please be sure to enter the email address at which you received the reviewer invitation.

If you would like additional guidance, see this 2-minute video tutorial, which provides step-by-step instructions on how to accept or decline an assignment within the website.

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Remove my information/deactivate). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.
Dear Dr. Sari,

Thank you for agreeing to review manuscript PONE-D-20-38833, entitled "CLINICAL PROFILES OF GLAUCOMATOUS PATIENTS WITH HIGH-AND LOW-TENSION OPTIC DISC HEMORRHAGES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY".

To download the paper now, please click this link: [View Submission]

Your review due date is Jan 30 2021 11:59PM EST

PLOS ONE employs a structured reviewer form to help reviewers focus on our publication criteria. If you have not used this form previously, we encourage you to learn more here. Please contact us at plosone@plos.org with any questions. You can also visit the PLOS Reviewer Center for peer review guides, tips, and other resources.

You may submit your comments online at [Submit Recommendation]. It is very important to submit your review through the electronic system rather than by email. If you do not have your username and password, they can be retrieved by clicking the "Send Username/Password" button in "Editorial Manager".

We would also like to remind you about the PLOS ONE publication criteria listed below, which focus on the technical aspects of a study, rather than more subjective evaluations of issues like impact or "interested level" in essence. PLOS ONE wishes to publish ANY report of scientific research that will make a valid contribution to the scientific record.

1. The study presents the results of original research.
2. Results reported have not been published elsewhere.
3. Experiments, statistics, and other analyses are performed to a high technical standard and are described in sufficient detail.
4. Conclusions are presented in an appropriate fashion and are supported by the data.
5. The article is presented in an intelligible fashion and is written in standard English.
6. It is easy to assess the supposed conclusions are valid without reading the full text.
7. The article adheres to appropriate reporting guidelines and community standards for data availability.

Therefore, your evaluation of this submission and your recommendation to the Academic Editor should focus on the above criteria.

With kind regards,

PLOS ONE
plosone@plos.org

Note: An iCalendar file is attached to this email which can be used to set a reminder for this review on your default calendar (Outlook, Apple Calendar, Google Calendar, etc.).

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. [Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.]

v.Due.ics
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: PLOS ONE <em@editorialmanager.com>
Date: 27 January 2021 16:48:06 GMT+7
To: Masitha Dewi Sari <masitha_ds@yahoo.co.id>
Subject: Review assignment for PONE-D-20-38883 is due soon - [EMID:13b31b30b66bf2ecf]
Reply-To: PLOS ONE <plosone@plos.org>

PONE-D-20-38883
CLINICAL PROFILES OF GLAUCOMATOUS PATIENTS WITH HIGH- AND LOW-TENSION OPTIC DISC HEMORRHAGES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY
PLOS ONE

Dear Dr Sari,

Thank you for agreeing to submit a review on PLOS ONE manuscript “CLINICAL PROFILES OF GLAUCOMATOUS PATIENTS WITH HIGH- AND LOW-TENSION OPTIC DISC HEMORRHAGES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY.” As a reminder, your review is due by Jan 30 2021 11:59PM EST and can be submitted at https://www.editorialmanager.com/pone/

We understand that the COVID-19 pandemic may affect your ability to work on this assignment. PLOS ONE is happy to provide extensions on reviewer assignments. Please email us at plosone@plos.org if you require additional time.

If you are unable to submit your comments by the due date mentioned, please be aware that the Academic Editor may proceed to render a decision based on the or her own evaluation of the manuscript or reviews received, in an effort to provide a timely review process. If you would like step-by-step instructions for submitting your review, please see this 2-minute video tutorial: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SnQ5dAjCM0Q. You can also visit the PLOS Reviewer Center for peer review guides, tips, and other resources: http://reviewers.plos.org.

To download the paper now, please click this link: https://www.editorialmanager.com/pone/asp?id=42953459&f=122553YMA

To submit your review, please follow this link: https://www.editorialmanager.com/pone/asp?id=4235352576f=AG1M71LF

We appreciate your support for PLOS ONE. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or concerns.

Kind regards,
PLOS ONE
plosone@plos.org

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: https://www.editorialmanager.com/PONElogin.asp?amr). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: PLOS ONE <em@editorialmanager.com>
Date: 27 January 2021 16:48:06 GMT+7
To: Masitha Dewi Sari <masitha_ds@yahoo.co.id>
Subject: Review assignment for PONE-D-20-38883 is due soon - [EMID:13b31b30b66bf2ecf]
Reply-To: PLOS ONE <plosone@plos.org>

PONE-D-20-38883
CLINICAL PROFILES OF GLAUCOMATOUS PATIENTS WITH HIGH- AND LOW-TENSION OPTIC DISC HEMORRHAGES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY
PLOS ONE

Dear Dr Sari,

Thank you for agreeing to submit a review on PLOS ONE manuscript “CLINICAL PROFILES OF GLAUCOMATOUS PATIENTS WITH HIGH- AND LOW-TENSION OPTIC DISC HEMORRHAGES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY.” As a reminder, your review is due by Jan 30 2021 11:59PM EST and can be submitted at https://www.editorialmanager.com/pone/

We understand that the COVID-19 pandemic may affect your ability to work on this assignment. PLOS ONE is happy to provide extensions on reviewer assignments. Please email us at plosone@plos.org if you require additional time.

If you are unable to submit your comments by the due date mentioned, please be aware that the Academic Editor
If you are unable to submit your comments by the due date mentioned, please be aware that the Academic Editor may proceed to render a decision based on his or her own evaluation of the manuscript or reviews received. In an effort to provide a timely review process. If you would like step-by-step instructions for submitting your review, please see this 3-minute video tutorial: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SnQ5daJcM0Q. You can also visit the PLOS Reviewer Center for peer review guides, tips, and other resources: http://reviewers.plos.org.

To download the paper now, please click this link: https://www.editorialmanager.com/pone/i.asp?id=4235349981=i1ZS3YMA

To submit your review, please follow this link: https://www.editorialmanager.com/ponea.asp?id=4235350781=IG1MT71L

We appreciate your support for PLOS ONE. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or concerns.

Kind regards,
PLOS ONE
plosone@plos.org

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: https://www.editorialmanager.com/pone/login.asp?e=). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: PLOS ONE <em@editorialmanager.com>
Date: 29 January 2021 16:24:30 GMT+7
To: Masitha Dewi Sari <masitha_dsi@yahoo.co.id>
Subject: Thank you for the review of PONE-D-20-38883 - [EMID:1ee848a2da12fe9f]
Reply-To: PLOS ONE <plosone@plos.org>

PONE-D-20-38883

CLINICAL PROFILES OF GLAUCOMATOUS PATIENTS WITH HIGH-AND LOW-TENSION OPTIC DISC HEMORRHAGES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY
Dr Izabela Almada

Dear Dr Sari,

Thank you for taking the time to review PLOS ONE manuscript PONE-D-20-38883 'CLINICAL PROFILES OF GLAUCOMATOUS PATIENTS WITH HIGH-AND LOW-TENSION OPTIC DISC HEMORRHAGES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY'. We greatly appreciate your assistance.

To access a copy of your submitted comments please navigate to the 'Completed Assignments' folder of the Reviewer Main Menu in your Editorial Manager account. Once the editor has proceeded to make a decision you can expect to receive a notification.

Kind regards,
PLOS ONE

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: https://www.editorialmanager.com/pone/login.asp?e=). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.
Balas, Balas ke Semua atau Teruskan

Sent from my iPhone
Begin forwarded message:

Sent from my iPhone
Begin forwarded message:

From: PLOS ONE <plos@plos.org>
Date: 14 February 2021 23:31:18 GMT-7
To: mastitha_devi@yahoo.co.id
Subject: From: PLOS ONE <plos@plos.org>

Dear Mastitha Devi Sari,

I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of PLOS and PLOS ONE to say thank you for your hard work as a Regular Contributor throughout 2020. Your expert contributions and support for Open Science have made it possible for the scientific community to find outstanding reliable research in a time when equity and accessibility in science are needed more than ever. THANK YOU.

Together we’re championing Open Science!

As you know, at PLOS we’re big advocates for research accessibility and this year we’ve worked even harder to bridge the gap between researchers and researchers, in a number of new initiatives, such as alternative publishing models, and new article types that we empower authors to push the boundaries of science.

In 2020 PLOS also marked one year of published peer review and in June we saw opt-ins increase to 35% of eligible authors from across the PLOS Journals, choosing to make their peer review process public by publishing it with a peer review report in PLOS ONE.

PLOS ONE is a leading public health journal and is one of the first to introduce the Editorial Recon, a new open peer review model that enables authors, editors, and reviewers to respectively contribute and stand behind science to increase transparent and valid research.

In an effort to increase the accessibility of scientific research PLOS ONE has invested in multiple initiatives throughout 2020 to reshape the landscape of Open Science. In January 2020, the journal launched a brand new article type: Registered Reports. In this model, peer review takes place prior to conducting research and data collection, providing authors with valuable feedback on their study design. The journal also joined our new Institutional Partnership

Thank you again for your support and contributions.

Best regards,

Mastitha Devi Sari
PLOS ONE