



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_20784
Title of the Manuscript:	A pilot, randomized sham control trial of autologous bone marrow stem cells in acute ischemic central retinal vein occlusion (sic study)
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The manuscript characterizes a “case series” not a clinical trial in my opinion. In a clinical trial the author should mention where the data was collected, how ample size was determined, the method used to generate the random allocation sequence, type of randomisation. I encourage the author to follow the Consort Checklist. (http://www.consort-statement.org) 2) Line 41, page 2: anterior segment neovascularization characterizes neovascular glaucoma, it doesn't lead to neovascular glaucoma. 3) Line 92, page 4: Please explain how many times a day the eye drops were prescribed. 4) Line 93, page 4: Please explain wich similar post-procedure topical drops were prescribed. Artificial tears for example? 5) Please explain on Methods if it was a single intravitreal injection. 6) Line 136, page 6: The statements “Both patients who received intravitreal injection of stem cells had minimal intraocular inflammation on the first week ...” and “So it gives a little evidence that the risk of severe inflammation ... is less likely.” does not agree with the results on Line 105 (“On first post op day patient had dense vitreous haze in centre wich persisted till 4 weeks”) and on Line 111 (“On first post operative day there was 4+ cells in AC wich resolved by 2 weeks”. Those statements should be removed. (Lines 136 to 139, page 6). 7) I couldn't find the reference number 2 at Pubmed. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Line 24: “...trabeculectomy to control intraocular pressure. The other patient in control group lost follow up after 2 weeks.”sounds better. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Lines 41, 61 and 70: it should be “neovascularization (not neovascularisation). 3) All abbreviations should be explained when cited for the first time in the manuscript: anti-VEGF (line 43), NVI (line 45), AC paracentesis (line91) 4) Line 56: it should be “neurotrophic” (not “neurotropic”). 5) Line 67: it should be “through”(not “thorough”). 6) Line 77: “Patients in control group underwent sham procedure in wich they were positioned...”should be better than “...where in patients were... 7) Line 78 and 93: “... with the syringe hub...”should be better. 8) Line 82: it should be “heparinized” (not “heparinised”). 9) Line 90: it should be “quadrant”. 10) Line 100: “angle neovascularization”sounds better than “neovascularization of angle”. 11) Line 101: “fundus fluorescein angiography 12) Line 105: Snellen should be written with capital letter. 13) Avoid abreviations: “first post op day”. 14) Line 136: “Both guys...”instead of “both the guys...” 15) Line 143: “In both patients”sounds better than “In both the patients”. 	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Flavia Ticly
Department, University & Country	University of Campinas, Brazil