

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80329
Title of the Manuscript:	Anti-VEGF therapy in ophthalmology
Type of the Article	Review 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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>THE STRUCTURE SHOULD BE REVIEWED IN DEPTH WITH A CLEARER AND MORE STRAIGHTFORWARD SEQUENCE LIKE</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. INTRODUCTION 2. OBJECTIVES 3. METHODS: SHOULD BE PLACED IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE AIMS OF THE PAPER; SHOULD PROVIDE INFORMATION ABOUT FILTERS APPLIED (LANGUAGE, PERIOD, TYPE OF PAPER ETC.); SHOULD PROVIDE INFORMATION ON APPRAISAL METHODS AND THE METHODS TO ASSESS THE CONTRIBUTION OF EACH PAPER (HOW WERE THE PAPERS ASSESSED? I SUGGEST THE OXFORD LEVEL OF EVIDENCE, IT IS A LITTLE BIT OLD BUT STILL USED) 4. RESULTS <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1. RESULT OF LITERATURE SEARCH (NR, OF PAPERS RETRIEVED, ACCEPTER REFUSED) 4.2. MECHANISM OF ANGIOGENESIS 4.3. (...) 5. DISCUSSION 6. CONCLUSION <p>OTHER MAJOR REVISION</p> <p>LINE 162: IT SHOULD BE MENTIONED ALSO THE APPROVAL BY THE EUROPEAN MEDICINES AGENCY (EMA)</p> <p>LINE 163: IT IS INAPPRORATE TO RECOMMEND AN OFF-LABEL USE</p> <p>LINE 207: DR IS NOT A LIFE-THREATENING DISEASE</p> <p>LINE 213-216: PLS PROVIDE REFERENCE</p> <p>LINES: 230-232: PLS PROVIDE REFERENCE</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>I recommend, therefore, to accept the paper with major revisions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A straightforward structure, • A more detailed description of search methods, • Punctual reference of all statements, • A writing register adequate to a scientific publication. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>The theme is highly interesting the general comments are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The structure must be reviewed - Methods should be clearly described - Reference should be provided when data are shown - The wordings and definitions should be compliant with the general lexicon of scientific publications 	

Review Form 1.6

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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Salvatore Bianco
Department, University & Country	University Tor Vergata Rome, Italy