



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_10573
Title of the Manuscript:	<u>ROCK INHIBITORS: FUTURE OF ANTI-GLAUCOMA MEDICATION???</u>
Type of the Article	Minireview 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	Scientifically needs a profound revision I have some major comments: Abstract: The abstract is badly written and do not transmit the main goal of this paper. Introduction: Current trends: There are other drugs in clinical trials, the RHO kinase inhibitors are one of those but not the only one. So the authors should include this drugs in the possible "current trends". Mechanism of action Profoundly incomplete. The pathophysiology of the RHO kinase action is only illustrated and not described. The authors should re-write this section taking in account the numerous literature published in the recent years. Animal studies: There are more animal studies with different clinical effects described from different and important groups that are not described here. The group of I. Stalmans has numerous works on this and is not referred. Clinical trials: this section is profoundly incomplete. There are some trials and drugs that the authors does not include. Bibliography: also quite incomplete having only references until 2011. There are 12 references on pubmed after that and being 3 revisions.	Abstract: It has been rewritten emphasising on the point that it reflects the article. Introduction: New drug molecules under research have been mentioned now, with special focus on ROCK inhibitors. Mechanism of action: pathophysiology has been explained in few sentences, after going through recent literature. Animal Studies: Although, no mention has been made of animal studies conducted by any researcher but as per comment, the molecule studied by I Stalman has been added in the ongoing trials list. • A new role of ROCK inhibitors has been added to animal studies Clinical trials: all the new drugs till date have been added with a remark on the phase of trial of each drug. Bibliography: updated as new researches added.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Some ex. of sentences that have to be rewritten: Line 32 – A should be α Line 36 – “glaucoma treatment world” Line 41 – the subtitle should not start with “These...” Line 42 – “These target cells...to enhance...” Line 66 – “endothelial 1” should be endothelin Line 88 – “may aid us in treating glaucoma is...surgery” Line 119 – “such drugs” doesn’t make sense. That paragraph starts talking about ROCK signalling and then switches the focal point. Another problem is that the ROCK abbreviation has two different meanings throughout the text. Table 1 doesn’t have a reason to exist, since the text has all that information and more. Lines 61 and 62 – that point about age, glaucoma and Rho-kinase has to better explained References should be rewritten following a single model throughout Table 1 isn’t mentioned in the manuscript. Furthermore, it adds nothing extra to the text. Fig 1 isn’t mentioned in the text.	All these corrections have been incorporated. ‘ROCK inhibitors’ has been used in the article uniformly. Table has been made more informative and lines from text have been deleted. Line 61 and 62- explained in detail References formatted Table and figure mentioned in the text
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		