



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	

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	This is an interesting manuscript providing Apoptosis of corneal stromal cell. Many readers who are not clinical scientist are not familiar to basic research and terms. Thus, the authors tried to describe more detailed information about tissue stain & figure legends. (e. g) Figure 3, General ophthalmologist could not understand the meaning of the Special stain, and abbreviations (NC, C ...).	The reviewer's comments are well accepted. The figure legends have been abbreviated in the text and are also highlighted in the manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Page 2, Line 35 Please use the abbreviation at first position (ECM) Page 2, Line 36-37: Please add the reference about "effect of degradation of ECM" Page 2, Line 47, Please modify "Abalain etal" to "Abalain et al. " Page 4, Line 83 Please clarify the sentence as follow; All data are expressed as mean +/- SEM	1. The abbreviation of ECM is been added in page 1 line 35. 2. Reference for the collagen degradation is been added in the text and highlighted in the manuscript. 3. etal has been modified as <i>et al</i> in the revised manuscript as per the reviewers comments. 4. The results of all the experiments were given as a mean with standard error of the mean (+/-) value. In order to clarify this , following modified sentence is included in the revised manuscript "The expression of standard deviation has been corrected as +/- SEM" Page 4, Line 83 as per the reviewers suggestion and is highlighted in the manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Reviewer's report: There are minor grammatical and textural errors that should be corrected. Level of interest :An article of importance in its field	The comment of the reviewer is well accepted the grammatical errors are modified and is highlighted in the manuscript.
---	--	---