



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
Methods: - all the points mentioned in the authors comments should be included in text as admission creiteria in PDR, definition of recurrence of ME. "The patients retinopathy were in two groups according the stage of retinopathy in each eye and after intervention the related right or left eye followed 17-26 months accordingly. The overall as the small study sample the patient recruited in two groups that had severed diabetic maculopathy or proliferative diabetic retinopathy with vitreous hemorrhage." The authors should clearly subdivide eyes into diabetic maculopathy group and PDR with vitreous hemorrhage group. And the right and left classification should be cancelled as either Rt. Or Lt eye can have PDR or ME. - Language again should be revised by a native English speaker	- The admission creiteria in PDR and recurrence of maculopathy describe in text. - The patients were describe in abstract and text in firt submission but again explain more indeed of classification limitation that the second groups were 6 cases .Beacuse as describe to patient the rare complication the PDR with vitrous hemorrhage due to sudden lost vision were most agree to injection versus ME. - Language again revised by a English speaker