



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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Methods; it is not appropriate to include PCV patients into the whole AMD group. Nowadays it is distinct that PCV patients do not respond to anti-VEGF treatment. Therefore, the PCV patients should be excluded from the study. -The baseline examinations and the examinations for each follow-up should be clearly described. -Which visual acuity chart is used? -The reinjection criteria should be clearly described. -Injection technique should be described. -Statistical methods should be described. 2. Results; mean age? -Gender distribution? -Visual acuity results among the groups? -CRT results? -Mean injection numbers? -This is an AMD study, you should include other results.	There was a report which showed ranibizumab is effective for PCV patients. (Ogino K, et al. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2013;54:3771-3779) We included PCV patients in our study because we would like to evaluate the efficacy of ranibizumab for PCV. We did not include the number of injections because the follow-up period of each patient was different. I revised and added some sentences in accordance with your instructions other than the above.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	English and writing mistakes should be corrected.	I corrected English and writing mistakes.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In the figure; it is better to use "subretinal fluid" instead of serous retinal detachment. "LogMAR" instead of logMAR. And the abbreviations should be explained below the figure legend.	I revised some sentences in the figure following your advice.