



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_39923
Title of the Manuscript:	Decreased expression of Cytosolic Phospholipase A2 in normal conjunctiva may be contributing to the formation of pterygium
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>)

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	The authors present an interesting study. One main limitation is that the normal conjunctiva tissue seems to have been taken from the same eye in another area. This may cause a bias in the statistical analysis. It would have been better to consider a different sample of normal eyes, and not simply a different area of the diseased eye. The authors may have considered conjunctival biopsy in eyes from different normal subjects without pterygium undergoing different surgery (i.e. during cataract surgery, vitrectomy, etc). Both samples taken from the same eye needs to be stated as a main limit in the study.	Dear reviewer, Thank you for your kindness and helpful comments. You are actually right, taking both samples from the same eye is a limitation of the study. We aimed to compare the differences between the healthy tissue and pterygium tissue in the same eye, because we believed that the expression of the PLA2 might be different in different eyes because of inter individual expression differences. Per your suggestion, this limitation has been added in the text as an limitation of the study. We highlighted the changes in the manuscript by using coloured text in red.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The authors can comment on how these finding can have an impact on day-to-day clinical practice and future studies in this field.	Per your suggestion, the new text has been added to the conclusion section.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study is simple, planned well and nicely presented. It has potential of being of clinical interest.	Thank you for your nice comment