



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	1. Title: in patients... 2. What diabetic retinopathy was being treated? DME? PDR? This needs to be specified throughout. 3. Report visions in the units (Snellen?) that they were taken and put LogMAR in parentheses. 4. Do not begin sentences with numerals. 5. Abstract, Conclusion: reducing acuity would be making vision worse. 6. Proliferative and background retinopathies should not be mixed in the same paper. Choose one or the other. The authors present retrospective data on patients with diabetic retinopathy treated with a diode laser. Because of the English construction this manuscript is unreadable. The manuscript needs to be rewritten with the help of a native english speaking editor and then resubmitted so that a critical analysis can be done.	1-corrected title 2-Clinically significant macular edema and High risk characteristic proliferative diabetic retinopathy were inclusion criteria and ischemic maculopathy and proliferative diabetic retinopathy with vitreous haemorrhage were exclusion criteria. 3-The 1.21 Log mar(20/320 Snellen), The 0.83 Log mar(20/135 snellen). 0.92 Log mar (20/166 snellen) 4-corrected bigening of number. 5- Abstract, Conclusion: the reducing acuity change to vision worse. 6- The visual acuity outcome in high risk proliferative and maculopathy retinopathies enrolled in the study paper. Choose one or the other.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		