



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	I tried to read the manuscript but, as it was not reviewed neither by the authors nor by an English reviewer, A few examples: 1. In the ABSTRACT (RESULTS) “The results of this trial showed MEAN?MEDIAN? visual acuity from 1.21 logmar before laser therapy to 0.83 logmar 3 months after was improved, but this improvement decreased with time after intervention, witch 12 months after the intervention had been near before intervention. These results were not statistically significant($p>0.0.5$).” 2. On the 2nd line of the INTRODUCTION “One of the vascular complications of diabetes, retinopathy, an eye complication of diabetes is the most serious health and development over the last 40 years it has been reduced due Khtrkvry. However,since the prevalence of diabetes is retinopathy is a major problem remained.” 3. When the authors move from	1-The result of abstract is corrected as the visul acuity had significant difference in early post laser versus long time post laser treatment. 2-Introduction corrected grammerticaly. 3-The font corrected. 4-Methods explain more. 5-Table one also corrected. 6-The other are corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	introduction to method, they change the type of the “font” 4. Method is poor 5. The TABLE 1 that I received is unintelligible. The legend says there is a comparison between before and after laser treatment, but there is nothing in the table 6. And so on...	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		