



SDI Review Form 1.6

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.
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Authors present an interesting data set regarding the visual outcomes versus patients' vision satisfaction after intravitreal injection of Bevasizumb in diabetic retinopathy patients. My main concern is related to the English language in this manuscript. There are many English spelling/grammar mistakes need be corrected throughout the manuscript. I strongly recommend the authors to seek the assistance of a colleague expert in English, or to use a professional English-language editing service.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Authors use both objective tests on visual outcomes and a subjective questionnaire on patients' satisfaction. I suggest they add a figure/table to show the patient's rating/score of treatment success.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aling Dong
Department, University & Country	Department of Ophthalmology, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, USA