



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
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 paper "Levels of oxidised low-density lipoprotein and high sensitivity C-reactive protein associated with retinal vascular occlusions" is well and concisely prepared, understandable and the subject is actual. Nevertheless, the study addresses only 7 patients with retinal vascular occlusions and 2 controls. This number of patients is too small, and accordingly, it questions the validity of the obtained results. In particular, individual retinal vascular disorders have very different underlying mechanisms, which is neglected in such a small number of samples. (if a similar study include a larger number of patients may be discussed.): (3)	Thank you for your kind comments. 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. We agree: Line 134 "We acknowledge that the individual retinal vascular disorders have very different underlying proposed mechanisms and this limits the interpretation of our results." We would appreciate it if the reviewers



SDI Review Form 1.6

		could consider this pilot study in support of a larger study, which could definitively answer the points raised by this work.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		