



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_45816
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of efficacy of Omega3 fatty acids with Vitamin A and Vitamin C in the treatment of dry eye syndrome
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>)

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>1. No interpretation of negative change in the dry eye syndrome Assessment (Table 13).</p> <p>2. The conclusion contradicts the study's objective. "In this study we compared efficacy of omega 3 fatty acids with Vitamin A & C in treatment of dry eye". Did this study which showed which treatment has more efficacy?</p> <p>2. No data is presented on the socio-economic status of the patients thus how such statement is presented in the conclusion? Such statement needs revision. 'Results showed that lesser grade of dry eye is seen in patients with higher education, younger age group and with indoor jobs as compared to patients with outdoor jobs who had higher grade of dry eye in our study groups. Improvement was observed in TBUT, Schirmer'1 & 2, Rose Bengal, OSDI score and grade of dry eye in both 2nd study group (CMC + Omega 3 fatty acids) and 3rd study group (CMC+ Vitamin A&C) as compared to the control group. This improvement was more significant in 2nd study group as compared to 3rd group."</p>	<p>Negative change in this table was improvement of osdi score post treatment in study groups which has been explained</p> <p>This study was comparative study which showed that omega 3 fatty acids has more efficacy compare to vitamin a & c</p> <p>Correction done.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	Text editing is necessary throughout the manuscript. It is difficult to read it in present state	
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)	