



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_7224
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlating patents and peer review papers for diabetic cataract: Elements of a comprehensive knowledge base
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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The title of the manuscript does not make clear what this research is about. Besides, the term "correlation" is used here in an inappropriate manner. I would suggest changing the title so that it's evident that the paper examines if patent documents can provide earlier dissemination of knowledge compared to peer review papers.	We have changed this to: "Aldose reductase inhibitors for diabetic cataract: A study of disclosure patterns in patents and peer review papers"
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Some syntax errors need to be corrected (eg lines 77-78)	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		