



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_11667
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Required Injection Numbers During the First Year on the Clinical Course of Neovascular 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	In this manuscript, authors have studied the effect of injection numbers in the beginning of wet AMD treatment. Intravitreal injections of VEGF antibodies is a rather novel method for treating wet AMD and therefore, there is a need for studying and optimizing its effects. In addition, frequent injections are burdening both patients and clinics making fluency with best efficacy important for both parties. In the present manuscript, there is not much added value compared to previous studies but it seems suitable with the definition of journal policy. It is also positive that authors have noticed their weaknesses e.g. regarding the low number of patients, and it has been taken into account a possibility that higher numbers of injections may correlate with increased disease activity. There are just a couple of minor concerns, please find them below.	<i>Thank you very much for your valuable suggestions.</i>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• Conclusion in the abstract is a bit too optimistic. Please, have a look at the conclusions at the end of discussion. • In table 2 and thereafter, groups A, B, and C change into groups 1, 2, and 3?	<i>- Conclusion of the abstract was changed and nor appears in red in the manuscript.</i> <i>- All group names were changed to numbers and now appear in red in the manuscript.</i>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• Injection numbers (per group, in 12 months, 24 months etc.) could be presented in some table. It is interesting, how many injections were given and to how many patients, and now the data need to be collected from the text.	<i>-A new table was added as table 4.</i>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Ethical aspects have been taken into account.	<i>A sentence about ethical aspects was added into the end of the first paragraph of the manuscript and appears in red.</i>