



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
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	Here are my comments on the manuscript: 1) the word lased in line 115 should be replaced by lasered. 2) the fashioned 25 cannula is not efficient for passive aspiration of PFC so we must use the 23G back flush needle which is used for Injection of PFC in 23G Vitrectomy. 3) in the patient and methods section, there is 2 different periods of study. the 1st is from June 2013 to October 2013, the 2nd in from April 2012 to December 2012. Which is true? 4) the shaft of fashioned cannula is not perfectly straight so this must lead to some turbulence and some resistance.	Corrected 1 and 2 The second one April 2012 till December 2012 is the correct one.... Mixed with study interval of another study.... Apologize for mistake. Despite the residual bending, there was no resistance to flow.... Only one time resistance at the trocar entry...so it was revised and straightened.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		