



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_64569
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of continuous 0.5% ganciclovir eye drop treatment in secondary glaucoma associated with cytomegalovirus anterior uveitis
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:

<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/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	<p>Excellent and very concise article.</p> <p>The methodology however limited by small number of patients and the overlapped use of two concomitant medications, such as topic ganciclovir and topical corticosteroids, that could interfere positively in final control outcome of IOP and AU and the appreciation of their isolated effects, were acknowledged as being a limitation of the study within the final discussion.</p> <p>I considered this article as being very clear, concise and honest regarding its methodology, conclusions and limitations.</p> <p>Furthermore, the reading and the ophthalmological reasoning looked very clear and based on substantial literature.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	No. None.	
Optional/General comments	It was very nice and pleasant article to read. I enjoyed it very much.	



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> No. Not at all. The article seemed to fill all the requirements and protocols.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Paulo Ricardo Pereira de Oliveira</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Lutheran University of Brazil, Brazil</i>