



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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. A transition statement between the end of the introduction and the Methodology section is needed. 2. Can the reader access THIRDSPEACE? If so, please explain how. If not, how does this help the average reader? A reader might benefit if the authors gave instructions for patent searching using public databases. The use of only proprietary databases does not help readers of this manuscript. 3. The authors have used ARIs that prevent cataracts as their test topic for this paper. Since none of these has clinical value, this does not make a compelling argument for their thesis regarding the utility of patent searches. Discovering a patent for a drug that has no utility does not appear valuable. 4. The data presented is generally over 20 years old (dates of patent filing). Most of these preceded the widespread functionality of the internet. How do we know that when the patents were filed they would have been immediately searchable? Might it have taken months before the data was retrievable? The remote retrospective nature of this study does not seem able to answer these questions.	1. Done (new line 55-58). 2. THIRDSPEACE is not yet ready for public access (new lines 323-325), and right now there is nothing we can do about that beyond working on it. We do plan to make it accessible in due course. - Rules for patent searches in public databases vary with the database, and would have been beyond the scope of this paper. 3. The reasons for this are from health economics, not pharmacology: cataract surgery w/ IOL insertion has become extremely cost-effective, so it was more promising to develop ARIs for diabetic neuropathy (see new lines 203-204 and 295-299) 4. Prior to the general availability of internet access and public databases, peer review papers were no more easily or acutely searchable than patents. Both types of source documents were affected in comparable fashion. The long-term retrospective nature of the study is a clear limitation which we address in new lines 301-303 and 314-319.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Line 225: "It was quite a surprise..." For whom? I would rephrase this.	Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		