

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_82458
Title of the Manuscript:	A PROSPECTIVE STUDY ON CLINICAL EFFICACY OF INTRAVITREAL BEVACIZUMAB AND MACULAR GRID LASER IN PATIENTS WITH MACULAR EDEMA SECONDARY TO BRANCH RETINAL VEIN OCCLUSION
Type of the 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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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	<p style="text-align: center;">ATTACHMENT</p> <p>This article is wellnitted and balance one except few minor changes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sample: The author mentioned in Para "Methods" that randomized prospective interventional study done for a period of two years which consists of 30 patients. After inclusion criteria and exclusion criteria etc., the author mentions that in the last Para of "Methods" in Page No. 3, <i>"The results of these 32 patients were collated"</i> When the actual patients figure is 30, how is that results of 32 patients have come. The author should explain and correct the figures. 2. The author mentions that the samples were taken between the range of 40-73 years of male and female. Whereas, in Table – I , in age range column, in the last one he mentions 66 -70 years. The author should explain whether he has not taken into consideration people above the age of 70 or 70 to 73 which is the original figure mentioned. 3. In the results part under Table – I, the author mentions, <i>"In our study, it is seen that most of the patients (81%) were having any co morbidity, either diabetes mellitus or hyper tension or both."</i> Whereas, In the exclusion criteria and ocular exclusion criteria the narration is different. The author should examine the variation and correct the same. 4. After discussion and before conclusion, the author should add two paragraphs under <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Suggestions b) Future study 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>5. Since the author have declared no competing interest. It is good.</p> <p>6. The author also mentioned that, they obtained consent from the patients who was selected for this research work.</p> <p>7. There are some typographical errors/ mistakes that are cropped into the manuscript. The author is advised to look into the manuscript and correct them</p> <p>-----</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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:	C.L. Avadhani
Department, University & Country	Annamalai University, India