



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	The authors should clearly state why this analysis was performed. They cite two published studies in the Introduction in which injection frequency did not affect nAMD outcomes. Why are the authors addressing this same question? Is there something distinct about this population? In the Discussion, the authors indicate that a limitation of the study is the small sample size. Since this research question has been proposed in the past, why didn't the authors carry out this study with sufficient power? The writing in the Abstract and Introduction is awkward and difficult to follow	- We did not have enough number of patients to carry this study to a more sufficient power. -Little changes were made in the abstract.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The first part of the title is awkward and unclear: "The Effect of Required Injection Numbers..."	-The title was not changed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The data presented in the Results section is clear and easy to follow. Overall, it is not clear to the reader how this study contributes to AMD research.	
---	---	--