



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 87109

**Title:** Efficacy and safety of anti-vascular endothelial growth factor agents on corneal neovascularization: a meta-analysis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer’s code:** 05327699

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MBBS, MNAMS, MS

**Professional title:** Additional Professor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** India

**Author’s Country/Territory:** Taiwan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-07-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yu-Lu Chen

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-09-25 05:48

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-09-25 06:24

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, 1. The authors need to mention the formulation of anti-VEGF - sub-conjunctival/topical. Which formulations were more effective? Which anti-VEGF was more cost-effective? 2. The authors shall add one paragraph on What were the complications of these anti-VEGF? Any sight-threatening complication? 3. The authors must mention - what new information this meta-analysis adds to the existing literature. 4. The authors must take the help of any English - editor. Thanks