



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_21875
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF PHOTOCOAGULATION 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	Looks like post graduate thesis submitted (cannot be a retrospective study) for publication. Authors have to make necessary correction before resubmitting the revised version of the paper according to reviewer's comments. Major organisation is essential for understanding the importance to achieve the stated objectives.	Organisations name would be inappropriate to mention .
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Abstract Results: 16 eyes PRP+16 eyes focal laser+8 eyes grid laser=40 eyes Was it additional treatment given for 8 eyes by PRP with focal/grid laser-clarify visual acuity after laser was during presentation was-what is the meaning-clarity needed Conclusion Remove number order in conclusion section aim of study already mentioned-no need repeating-line 28-30 Introduction	Yes , additional treatment given for 8 eyes by PRP with focal laser. Number order removed. Aim of the study removed .28-30 lines



SDI Review Form 1.6

	laser therapy is aimed at inducing of new vessels-what is the meaning-correct line 49 line 73 modify line101- set at 1 mw Methods and materials-reorganise Results Line 149-visual acuity at presentation was more than 6/12 means what-is it 6/6-ETDRS visual acuity charts could have been used Line 161-visual acuity after laser was during presentation was more than 6/12- meaning? Correct Configure small sentence properly to paragraphs Discussion very insufficient Information from published article lacking for similarities and differences Conclusion section is numbered-remove number References- Insufficient At least 20 reference needed for a scientific paper for maintain standard of the research work	- Regression of new vessels. -done -done -Modified -Yes ,ETDRS charts been used. - Corrected - Conclusion part – numbers removed. - References been added.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Missing reference citation noted-correction needed	
	Include as many as reference citations within 5 to 7 years of publication from Medline/pub med	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		