

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Ophthalmology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRROP_128329
Title of the Manuscript:	A Randomised Prospective Study Evaluating the Administration of Ranibizumab for 5 or 30 Days Prior to Vitrectomy in Severe Diabetic Retinopathy: Complications, Outcomes, and Development of Retinal Traction
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Newer technique by for vitrectomy in sever diabetic retinopathy is current topic of debate. Its a good topic to be by adding a ranibizumab with good number for subject.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract: It should contains some introductory part of disease. You can take from Introduction part of article.; Make para Methodology, under methodology add study participants and then procedure for groups. You should not mention the mean age or number of patients participated. As it is just a procedure how did you select the patients. This all comes in result section. Results are satisfactory.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need to improve scientific writing	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mital Bhadania
Department, University & Country	India