



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_10095
Title of the Manuscript:	Visual outcome versus vision satisfaction after intravitreal Bevasizumb injection in diabetic retinopathy.

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The quality was not improved much. There are still quite some grammar and spelling mistakes. To name a few, in Conclusion (page 2)," ...however it was not compatible to all of the patients asking visual satisfaction..."Did the authors here mean "... however it was not compatible to ask all of the patients visual satisfaction" ? In the last paragraph at page 3, "The patients retinopathy were in two groups according the stage...", it should be "The patients' retinopathy was divided into two groups according to the stage...". Unfortunately there are still many others. I suspect whether the author really used "a professional English-language editing service".	The quality try to improved. The grammar and spelling again checked. In Conclusion (page 2)," changed to the meaningful scentence "... however it was not compatible to ask all of the patients visual satisfaction" ? In the last paragraph at page 3, changed to"The patients' retinopathy was divided into two groups according to the stage...". Finally the text was edited by a professional English-language editing service".