



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_20011
Title of the Manuscript:	Visual acuity outcome after diode laser therapy in patient with 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	Methods and material: This was not comprehensive enough 1. 'In this descriptive analytic study, Medical records of patients with diabetic retinopathy who were candidates for laser therapy in Birjand valiAsr Hospital.' –this is an incomplete sentence. 2. What was the patient data collected? 3. I found this article difficult to read. There are a lot of typographical, grammatical and spelling errors 4. References are not used in necessary places Ethical approval: Yes. There is need for patient and institutional approval	1.Complit the scetence 2-The patients data was age,sex,visual acuity and post treatment time. 3-The typographical and grammatical mistake corrected. 4- References are used in necessary places. Ethical approval:. There is no need for patient and institutional approval
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors must first of all check grammatical errors throughout the article. Most sentences are incomplete and so difficult to comprehend	