

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81116
Title of the Manuscript:	OCULAR DUPLEX DOPPLER SONOGRAPHY AND ITS ROLE IN IN EARLY DIAGNOSIS OF DIABETIC RETINOPATHY
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.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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1 Discussion lack of references.2 Provide more comparisons with previous studies and give their references in the "discussion" section.3 Explain the utility of the findings of this study. It is not clear the usefulness of Doppler sonography in diabetic retinopathy. What can it add to fundus examination? How can it help the clinician? Why this technique should be performed in daily diabetic patients' examination? Why fundus examination is not enough?4 Doppler sonography is difficult to perform and requires an expensive instrument, while fundus examinations requires just a slit lamp and a 90D lens. Why an Hospital should buy this instrument?5 Explain in which cases a sonography should be performed in daily routine.6 Explain future perspectives.7 It is not clear the usefulness of doppler sonography in diabetic retinopathy. What are the advantages?	<p>Thank you for your, review and comments, as advised references and comparisons have been added.</p> <p>Utility Diabetes Mellitus is a chronic multisystem endocrine disease with short and long term complications. One of the main long term complications causing significant reduction in quality of living is diabetic retinopathy and its spectrum, the others being nephropathy and neuropathy. As proved these vascular complications based on endothelial injury by glycation products start 5-10 years before someone is labelled diabetic as per the latest diagnostic criteria. Routine testing for the presence of nephropathy, retinopathy and neuropathy at the time of diabetes diagnosis is advocated. Retinopathy screening routinely employs fundoscopic and slit lamp examination which are quick, inexpensive and available in most facilities, whereas nephropathy screening usually involves a baseline sonography of abdomen to see renal anatomical status. Though fundoscopy is cheap and effective, it can only detect anatomical changes in the blood vessels after it has occurred which are permanent and irreversible. They also cannot assess the functional status or real time blood flow within these vessels which can be done by ocular doppler. Colour doppler indices like PI and RI changes occur before definite anatomical changes. Also Ocular sonography has the added advantage of diagnosing other posterior chamber pathologies associated with diabetes like retinal detachment, dense vitreous haemorrhage, choroidal neovascularisation, glaucoma and optic nerve head changes. Though Ocular sonography needs expensive equipment and operator expertise, the benefit it offers should encourage more widespread use of it. Moreover, any tertiary care hospital offering holistic diabetes management will be equipped with necessary sonography equipments for abdominal and vascular screening. In such cases, Ocular doppler and sonography needs only training of sonographers, radiologists and more patronage from referral departments..</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1 Correct some English language errors (corrections provides in the paper sent in return).2 Move chart 1 to "results" section.	Directed and necessary grammar corrections made. Chart moved to results section
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	Nil