



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_49377
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of phosphodiesterase type5 inhibitors on the development of retinopathy of prematurity: A Randomized Clinical Trial
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). Some abbreviations in this article were not explained, which made them difficult for readers to place. (Eg: VEGF, NCPAP, EPAS1, WHO, M.V, CPAP, etc). Kindly explain fully the meaning of all abbreviations on their initial usage, with the first abbreviation in a parentheses ().</p> <p>(2). Kindly make the material and methods coherent, and the methodology adopted for your clinical trial properly explained.</p> <p>3. Kindly move the informed consent and ethics committee approval to the end of the article, before the references. This will give room for your study design to connect with other data collection procedures in your material and methods.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. Cross check for minor sentence punctuations and grammatical errors, and correct accordingly. Restructure the highlighted sentences for proper understanding.</p> <p>2. In your introduction, it would have been better to start with a brief definition of ROP and explain fully the 5 basic stages in its classification, the causes and risk factors before other things, for the appreciation of other professionals worldwide.</p> <p>2. Kindly write your conclusion in a separate paragraph. Add a little more flesh to your conclusion. From your findings, give possible reasons for the no significant difference between sildenafil therapy and its effect on ROP development in premature infants treated with oxygen, eg (exclusion criteria like less than 1000g BW, future expanded criteria, larger population study etc).</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Red highlights on manuscript signifies delete /make corrections</p> <p>Green highlights on manuscript signifies add /corrected</p> <p>Good research article, but requires proper articulation and presentation,</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Umezurike benedict</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Eye Unit, Government House Clinic, Nigeria</i>