



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_15827
Title of the Manuscript:	Repeated Intravitreal Bevacizumab Injections versus Combined Intravitreal Bevacizumab and Posterior Subtenon Triamcinolone Injections for Treatment of Diabetic Macular Edema
Type of the 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 the conclusion and based on your results, it is not clear what the benefit of the combined treatment (Group B) is over the use of Bevacizumab alone (Group A). Can you clarify this point.	We concluded that the combination of subtenon TA and intravitreal bevacizumab is a safe and effective choice to treat DME avoiding the multiple intravitreal injections with its potential dangerous complications. Meanwhile, we used TA, which is more effective in reducing DME, in a safer way minimizing the risk of postoperative glaucoma and cataract reported with its intravitreal use. An Additive effect is thus supposed to exist when using both TA and bevacizumab for treatment of DME.
Minor REVISION comments	How many pseudophakic and phakic patients were enrolled in this research? How many patients have developed cataract in both groups, especially in the combined treatment group (Group B)? Although the average of the IOP in both groups was about the same, I would still like to know how many patients had IOP over 18mmHg and how many had over 21 mmHg in each visit.	There was 5 pseudophakic cases in group A and 9 pseudophakic cases in group B. No aphakic cases were found. No cataract had occurred in the follow up period In group A: preoperative, there were 10 eyes in which IOP is above 18 including 2 eyes with IOP 21 mmHg and no eye was above 21. At 1 month postoperative, 12 eyes were above 18 including 3 eyes above 21 mmHg. At 3 month postoperative, 9 eyes were above 18 and no eye was above 21 mmHg. At 6 month postoperative, 9 eyes were above 18 and no eye was above 21 mmHg. In group B: preoperative, there were 6 eyes in which IOP is was 18 and no eye was above 18.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		At 1 month postoperative, 10 eyes were above 18 and no eye was above 21 mmHg. At 3 month postoperative, 4 eyes were above 18 and no eye was above 21 mmHg. At 6 month postoperative, no eye was above 18 mmHg.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		