



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In this manuscript, authors mentioned about visual outcome after IVB for DR. I have some comments. 1) For abstract, please write Aim or Purpose instead of Introduction. 2) In abstract part (result), what is “p=0/048, 0/006”? 3) What kind of patients choose for IVB? It is very difficult to discuss DME/PDR/NVG on same ground. 4) Why authors separate right eye and left eye? 5) I think authors evaluate Pt's satisfaction	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(grade 1 to 3 written in Method).Where is this result?I ti very difficult to say their satisfaction only using VA. 6) At 4th paragraph of discussion, “After 3 months of ranibizumab...”. Did authors do IVR? 7) Figure 2 and 3 seems to be same eye (especially, 2c = 3c, 2D=3D). In addition, photograph is not enough quality to identify NVI.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	8) From half part of discussion, font seems to be changed	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer