

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Ophthalmology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15585

**Title:** Current understanding and management of aggressive retinopathy of prematurity

**Reviewer's code:** 00505215

**Reviewer's country:** Saudi Arabia

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-29 13:43

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-15 06:36

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please provide a clean copy of the manuscript. What I see is a mess and can not be reviewed to decide its acceptance. Is it a case report or a full length article. Either way, please clarify since I see a Case Report in there.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Ophthalmology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15585

**Title:** Current understanding and management of aggressive retinopathy of prematurity

**Reviewer's code:** 00505045

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-29 13:43

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-01 05:25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reviewed the literature about the aggressive posterior ROP with a representative case. This is a nice review with quite reasonable length. 1. In the beginning of the manuscript, the authors are explaining the terminology of the ROP with very simple definitions. In this section it is good to explain also the term of type 1 ROP. Because it is given later in the manuscript. 2. The manuscript I read was a draft version and the authors should send the final amended version.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Ophthalmology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15585

**Title:** Current understanding and management of aggressive retinopathy of prematurity

**Reviewer's code:** 00505101

**Reviewer's country:** India

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-29 13:43

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-02 02:51

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Other indicators of plus disease include engorgement of the iris vessels, vitreous haze, and papillary rigidity "Papillary rigidity" is to be changed into "pupillary rigidity" 2. Figure 1. Previous 24 week infant status post bevacizumab injection a for APROP. Authors are requested to add the pre bevacizumab photograph of the same APROP infant. 3. Authors need to submit the edited version of the article for the review than in the word document with tracking comments. 4. Article needs english editing.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Ophthalmology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15585

**Title:** Current understanding and management of aggressive retinopathy of prematurity

**Reviewer's code:** 00505265

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-29 13:43

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-10 05:17

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors have provided a well researched, written and presented review. There are some minor typographic errors that need correcting.