



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_13047
Title of the Manuscript:	The relationship of HLA-B27 and HLA-B51 on Non-Behcet uveitis
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 <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>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Observations Research by the author is an original and interesting work has not been published, it is relevant from the field of clinical and basic research allowing clarification of knowledge about recurrent ophthalmic disease entity and complex understanding. The manuscript may be accepted with minor modifications and higher initial structure, provided that they are modified. The observations are organized by sections presented in the manuscript. 1.- The reference number one to define the uveitis is very old (24 years), there are recent publications that provide more modern definitions, so the rest of the references show dates are not updated. 2.- How discarded infectious uveitis type, the method is not shown 3.- Paragraph 68 to 73 described the treatment to patients without any criteria for application of the drugs, is only used treatment options, without an organization regarding the condition of each study	1-Reference changed :Chang JHM, Wakefield D, Uveitis: a global perspective. Ocul Immunol Inflamm. 2002; 10:263-79. 2-We did not perform advanced laboratory tests to exclude the infectious uveitis like aqueous tapping and molecular biology testing for viral uveitis, only serum TORCH panel was performed. Therefore we might have missed some of the infectious anterior uveitis cases. 3- Patients that are contraindicated to start corticosteroids (diabetes, osteoporosis, hypertension, peptic ulcer etc) are excluded from the study and consulted on the relevant
---	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	subject. 4.- The authors did not show anywhere of the methodology regarding how to identify these groups CD8 lymphocytes corresponding to HLA-B27 and HLA-B51 antigens for subjects with uveitis. 5.- When not homogeneous study group the presence of HLA-B27 type (-) and HLA-B51 (-) in both women and men can result tends to be larger with regard to the other three groups of study 6.- Line 119 beware of inadequate spaces 7.- The most relevant data show better if they appear in the initial position of paragraph 142 8.- Paragraph 165 of the line "There is not much data about the positivity of HLA-B51 and non-ocular complications of Behcet diseases in the 166 literature" in this type of scientific writing is not certain that there are many or few items describing a condition or disease. 9.- Comparing results Sakamoto et al from line 166 refers to the Uveitis in the presence of Behcet's disease, whereas in this study uveitis were evaluated in the absence of the disease Behcet, so there is not a point of	clinics. 4- HLA-B51 and HLA-B27 typing were obtained from each patient 6-space corrected 7-changed to initial position of paragraph. 8-removed 9-removed
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	comparison because there are very different etiologies 10.- Rows 118 to 123 specifies that the treatments were different with respect to different positive and negative groups HLA-B27 and B51, so the results regarding treatment beforehand is known to be different between the study groups and consequently its results. 11.- The discussion described in paragraph 176 to 178, does not show enough scientific evidence to be affirmed by the author, it must contrast with other causes of visual prognosis 12.- Line 182 does not express accurately if it relates to their study groups or to other groups of studies 13.- Paragraph of lines 182 to 185 do not discuss with other studies about of this result, so it result is shown incomplete. 14.- Line 188 show that sought to identify the ocular complications in the study population, however, there isn't results about this statement in any place of the manuscript.	10- since this is a retrospective study treatment regimen is independent from HLA types. It depends on the severity and localization of uveitis. 11- This may be due to heterogeneity and low number of patients. 12- "When we look at our results there seems to be a difference between HLA groups in respect to clinical course, prognosis and treatment regimen of uveitis" sentence removed 13- Since there is few studies about non-Behçet uveitis we couldn't compare our all results with the literature. 14- ocular complications removed
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		