



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAMPS_11341
Title of the Manuscript:	Levels of oxidised low-density lipoprotein and high sensitivity C-reactive protein associated with retinal vascular occlusions
Type of the Article	Short 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 (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	The authors have studied on the levels of oxidized low-density lipoprotein and high sensitive-CRP in patients with retinal vascular occlusions. They have found an association between these parameters with this specific group of patients. I have the following points that should be addressed by the authors: 1. Although the subject in this Short Research Article is interesting and a novel subject, the number of the subjects in the patient groups and especially the number of control subjects (n=2) is not enough to suggest that there is such an association. If the authors increase the number of subjects (especially the control group), the results will be valuable enough. 2. The statistical analysis should be included in the Methods section, since it is important to be able to suggest such an association of the parameters with the specific disease group.	We wish to thank the reviewers for their insightful observation. Regarding point 1. We acknowledge that the numbers in this study are quite small and limit interpretation. We would appreciate it if the reviewers would consider this as a pilot study in support of a larger study, which could definitively answer the points raised by this work. We have amended the title (line 3), abstract (line 12) and text (line 12, 136, 139) to reflect that this study should be considered as a pilot study. We point out the limitations of this study in line 132. While the results are not significant however a trend is observed which provides evidence for a larger study to be performed. 2. Thank you for pointing this out Line 86 Mean values were compared using a students t-test, correlations were performed utilizing Pearsons Coefficient, a p value of < 0.05 was taken a statistically significant.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	1. The abbreviation of hs-CRP stands for <u>high sensitive</u> -CRP, <u>not high sensitivity</u> -CRP. It should be rewritten throughout the manuscript. 2. It is not "oxidised", it should be " <u>oxidized</u> ". It is important because the title includes this word.	1 and 2 Thank you for pointing this out. The changes have been made to the title, abstract and text as suggested.
Optional/General comments	The manuscript falls within the scope of Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences and it is of efficient novelty. However, it is of poor quality in its statistics and it is not scientifically robust enough.	Thank you for the feedback. We hope it may be considered as a pilot study and the statistics interpreted in that context.