

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_99193
Title of the Manuscript:	ROLE OF SUPRACHOROIDAL ANTI-VEGF INJECTIONS IN RECALCITRANT SEROUS PIGMENT EPITHELIUM DETACHMENT
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:

(<https://www.journalor.com/index.php/OR/editorial-policy>)

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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes, this is a novel method to treat the recalcitrant cases of PED. This study does not explain detailed methodology for the technique. This study also lacks to explain the statistical significance of data collected so that the correct conclusion can be drawn from the observations. 2. No, A cross-sectional study to evaluate the outcomes of suprachoroidal anti-vegf injections in recalcitrant serous pigment epithelium detachment patients 3. Yes, but structured is better 4. No, need results and limitations 5. No, needs to make detailed methodology and proper analysis of data 6. Yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct the results and explain the p values • Rewrite the discussion • Add limitations 	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Needs some improvement in grammar at several places.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amit Kumar Jain
Department, University & Country	KD Medical College and Hospital, India