



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_8366
Title of the Manuscript:	Combined Trabeculectomy with beta irradiation with and without intravitreal bevacizumab for neovascular glaucoma
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	Abstract; 1-How were the selection of two groups in method section 2-The conclusion are not prepared according to result in this descriptive study. 3-So,conclussin adjust to report the outcome not recommendation that it was not a comparative study with significant difference. Introduction; 1-The purpose dose not needed to highlight. Methods; 1-Explain Inclusion and exclusion criteria. 2-Inform consent is taken? 3-Figure have not a good quality. 4-The third group that was don only trabeculectomy were more comparable versus adjunctive therapy Results; 1-It is logical to consider the mean age. 2-Table 1 is not valid for example; Mean age (67.6 ± 9.8 years). 3-The long time result of INV regression are detrimental not one week after intervention. 4-Poor picture quality. Discussion; 1-The judgment could be better between three groups ,so by reducing Iop the trabeculectomy may influence too. 2-There is no discussion about the visual acuity,is ther any mean visual acuity comparison in two groups 3- conclusion is not according of statistically significant finding in the results. It will be better to describe to controlling of IOP among two groups and the need of a comparative study versus conventional procedure. The other study finding such as Of 42 eyes of 42 patients identified, change in IOP, additional glaucoma surgeries required, and number of IOP-lowering topical medications required after trabeculectomy did not differ significantly between groups	Done Changed Changed Done Added Added Apologize for bad quality but due to drive failure all pictures were lost except the present Considered Mean age was calculated according to ages present in table Apologize for bad quality The study designed for 2 groups Visual acuity was measured by snellens charts and not all patients could be changed int LogMAR due to defective vision . so data was invalid in some patients



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Adjunctive Intravitreal Bevacizumab-Combined Trabeculectomy Versus Trabeculectomy Alone in the Treatment of Neovascular Glaucoma. Source: Journal of Ocular Pharmacology & Therapeutics . Feb2010, Vol. 26 Issue 1, p111-118. 8p. 5 Charts, 1 Graph. Author(s): Chih-Hsin Chen; Ing-Chou Lai; Pei-Chang Wu; Yung-Jen Chen; Yi-Hao Chen; Jong-Jer Lee; Ya-Chi Liu; Hsi-Kung Kuo	It was considered in the discussion
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1-The manuscript require grammatical correction. 2-Table revision	done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	How it could be possible without any statistical significant difference between groups prefer one approach to other?	As shown in iop the ivb is better control than the other group