



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMMR_17702
Title of the Manuscript:	Fashioned 25G Cannula for Injection of Heavy Liquid during 23G Vitrectomy for Primary Simple Rhegmatogenous Retinal Detachment
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	I carefully reviewed the paper entitle: " Fashioned 25G Cannula for Injection of Heavy Liquid during 23G Vitrectomy for Primary Simple Rhegmatogenous Retinal Detachment". The paper refers about the evaluation of the practical use, safety and efficacy of an ease of fashioning of 25G cannula, for the injection of heavy liquid during Vitrectomy for simple Rhegmatogenous Retinal Detachment. In my opinion, the idea is clever because it reuses a cannula that often are not used in the vitrectomy, for an useful instrument that otherwise we should buy it. So, the idea it is clever and economical. However, the authors described and analyzed their results from 28 retinal detachments cases done by them using the new cannula. I think the results of vitrectomy are not dependent on the use or not of the new cannula; on the other hand the results depends more on the surgical skills of the surgeons to handle described retinal detachments. That is why, I believe the authors should shorten the article and just mention the excellent result of the new cannula without displaying the table or the statistics of patients who were done the surgeries.	I removed table 1 that mentions details about baseline criteria. I will stress more on the ease of injection and intra operative retinal reattachment without complications.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	On the other hand I would describe this original design in a report format as they do in other journals describing a new instrument or a variation to a surgical technique already used routinely. Also deepen a little more in the concept because this cannula does not work when used for passive aspiration of heavy liquid according to the experience of the authors. The paper is well written, with a correct English and just be wanting you to correct some capital letters at the beginning of sentences in the abstract.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		