



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_13310
Title of the Manuscript:	Solution for Deadspace In The Intravitreal Injection Of Ranibizumabe
Type of the Article	Short 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	1. The authors need to spell ranibizumab correctly. 2. ABSTRACT: these are drugs that inhibit the actions of vascular endothelial growth factor. 3. Lines 11 and 12: monthly injected over what period of time? 4. Line 17: What is the drawback to this system? 5. Why does dead space lead to economic loss? The cost of drug production is very small. Even if the manufacturer were able to package fewer drugs, the cost to the patient/insurance/government would be the same. I fail to see the relevance of this paper.	1. It was corrected. Line 12 and 24. 2. These are drugs that inhibit the actions of vascular endothelial growth factor is added. 3. in a one year period is added. Line 11 4. The drawback of this system is that, syringe system has dead space and is not pre-filled is added. Line 17 and 18. 5. An extra volume of 0.137 ml is required to obtain 0.05 ml of medicine for using syringe with non –billed rubber stopper while 0.100 ml extra volume is required for using syringe with billed rubber stopper. If pre-filled syringe system with billed rubber stopper is used only 0,014 ml extra volume is required to obtain 0.05 ml of medicine. Line 50-53.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I fail to see the relevance of this paper. Although the authors have calculated the deadspace, it is of no importance regarding cost or pricing. Their claims do not make sense in this economic world.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		