



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_12138
Title of the Manuscript:	Apoptosis of corneal stromal cells induced by telopeptides: An <i>invitro</i> study
Type of the Article	Experimental Research

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	-----	-----
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 15 abstract-results: “vibality” must be corrected as “viability”. Line 17 abstract-conclusion: “apopototic” must be corrected as “apoptotic” Line 63 “palaced”- “placed” 1- don't repeat the aim of study in conclusion of abstract! 2- The abbreviation (ECM) must be used firstly in the sentence which it was used earlier.	The reviewers comments are well accepted. The grammatical errors pointed by the reviewers are corrected in the text and are highlighted. 1. The conclusion part of the manuscript has been modified and the changes are highlighted in the text. 2. ECM has been expanded and abbreviated in page 2 line 35.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This study is interesting and structured. The discussion section may be better with more detail and references. Please clarify the ethical issue, if any	The reviewers comments are well accepted. The study does not involve any ethical issues and the study protocol was approved by the Institute ethical board.