



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	In this paper, authors present a study that enrolled 9 patients diagnosed with retinal vascular occlusive disorders, aiming to evaluate if the levels of two new biochemical markers of cardiometabolic risk (Ox-LDL and hs-CRP) are associated with those ophthalmological conditions and if that is statistically different from a control population (defined only by 2 individuals). The research question behind the study is interesting in clinical grounds and the design is correct. However, the number of recruited individuals is small and that is, in my view, the main problem when analysing the results. Authors say, in the title of the paper, that the levels of Ox-LDL and hs-CRP are associated with retinal vascular occlusions. Nevertheless, when looking at the results presented in Table 1, neither the comparison of "All	Thank you for you kind remarks. 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 (line12, 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 with the reviewer. The title has been changed, and association has been removed: "Levels of oxidized low-density lipoprotein and high sensitive C-reactive protein in retinal vascular



SDI Review Form 1.6

	patients” with the control group, nor the comparison between “Patients without comorbidity” and controls reach statistical significance (I assume that results would be significant if $p < 0.05$, because nothing is said about this in the section “Methods”). Having this, we can assume that there is probably a trend between high levels of Ox-LDL and hs-CRP and risk for retinal vascular disorders, but we cannot reject the null hypothesis with the presented values of p. So, all the text should be revised under this point of view, because it was not possible to demonstrate the existence of a statistically significant association between the main variables on study. Beyond this main issue, I have also some minor suggestions to make: 1. It is crucial to include in the Abstract the p values that were obtained in the comparisons performed. 2. The level of statistical significance should be provided in the section “Methods”. 3. In line 69, “aspirin” should be replaced by “acetylsalicylic acid”. 4. In line 70, “has been shown” should be replaced	occlusions: a pilot study” We therefore report the absolute levels in retinal vascular occlusive patients. It would take a larger study to demonstrate a true association if it exists. The reviewer is correct that $p < 0.05$ was taken to be statistically significant. The methods section has been altered to include statistical methodology (line 86) We agree with the reviewer. This non-significant trend is limited in what extrapolations can be made, but it does warrant further investigation. We have revised the text accordingly: Line 136 However, this is the first report of a possible trend towards higher mean levels of hs-CRP and Ox-LDL in patients with retinal vascular occlusions. This pilot study supports the case for larger prospective studies to elucidate the exact nature of these potential relationships and investigate their clinical significance 1. We agree. 2. The methods section has been altered to include statistical methodology (line 86) 3. We agree, change made. 4. We agree, change made.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	by “have been shown”. 5. In line 80, “walls” should replace “wells”. 6. In line 100, “patients” should replace “pateints”. 7. In line 103, “refernce” should be replaced by “reference”. . Patients gave their informed consent and authors say the study was conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki. Local Ethics Committee authorized the study.	5. We are informed that this process involves little wells, like small cups, so with respect we have made no change. 6. We agree, change made. 7. We agree, change made. This is correct.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		