



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_13281
Title of the Manuscript:	Preliminary Comparison of Ocular and Developmental Outcomes in Laser- and Bevacizumab-Treated Infants with Retinopathy of Prematurity
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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Good job. My suggestions are as follows 1- In abstract's method section you can add "how many eyes did you compare the study" 2- On page 1, line 22, the sentence "Bevacizumab intravitreal injection" should be revised as "Intravitreal Bevacizumab injection. 3- Instead of laser surgery you should use laser treatment in manuscript. 4- Could you explain cause of deaths? 5- Could you give "The average follow-up period"?	Response: Authors are deeply appreciated your comments and time. 1. We added how many eyes we compared. 2. Revised 3. Change all to laser treatment. 4. Explained cause of death on page 10 from lines 180 to 186 5. We planned to follow up these children up to 6 years of age and we are reporting the first two years' outcomes.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		