



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	This is a well-written manuscript and will provide new information to readers.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Page 4, line: The sentence should be re-written as shown below. Among eyes with typical AMD, 65 eyes had occult CNV without classic component, 17 had minimally classic CNV, 33 had predominantly classic CNV, and 5 had classic CNV. However, the total number of eyes with typical AMD should be 120. Please check again.	There were 115 eyes of typical AMD. Among them, 65 eyes had occult CNV, 17 had minimally classic CNV and 33 had predominantly classic CNV. I revised some sentences following your instructions.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		