



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_11330
Title of the Manuscript:	Tachyphylaxis to ranibizumab in the treatment of age-related macular degeneration
Type of the Article	Original 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors studied a prevalence rate of the patients who develop tachyphylaxis to ranibizumab in AMD. There was no significant difference in the prevalence of tachyphylaxis among the subtypes of AMD. Therefore, in the Abstract, "However, patients having tachyphylaxis had a lower prevalence of a classic CNV component than responders." should be deleted. Conclusions would be changed to "There are (a few percentage of) AMD patients who develop tachyphylaxis to ranibizumab. No significant difference is observed in the prevalence of tachyphylaxis among the subtypes of AMD."	I revised the sentences in abstract and conclusion in accordance with your instructions.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	P4, line 61, "0.3 of more units" Is unit a decimal or logarithmic visual acuity? P9, line 132, "ntravitreal" should be "intravitreal". P9, line 137, "because an anti-VEGF drugs" should be "because anti-VEGF drugs".	I corrected English mistakes and revised some sentences.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is interesting for the readers, and valuable for possible publication in the journal. PLEASE CLARIFY THE ETHICAL ISSUE, IF ANY	