SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_OR_25341**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Fuch's uveitis: A case report**
Type of the Article	**Case study**

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)

SDI 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	**Introduction** **Line 16 ...** at the end of this sentence, reference should be written for using this new terminology. Then, the serial number of references should be adjusted in the text as well as in references. **Presentation of case** Usually, this is written as "Case report". **Line 59** ... the vision in OD should be 50 centimeters and not 50 meters. Hand motion vision is within 1 meter only **Line 70** ... this sentence should be rewritten, conveying the message clearly. Spelling correction of the word "vitreo" should be done. The words "with applied retina" ....what is the meaning of these words? **Line 82** ... the word 'occurred' should be written as "performed" in this sentence. **Line 86** ... the words "without a suspect optic disc or any lesion in the retina" should be removed because the words 'fundoscopy in OD was normal' conveys that no lesion in any structure in the fundus. **Line 90** ... should be removed. It does not convey any useful meaning. Duration of follow up of the patient with eye findings, vision, IOP in OD at last follow up should be written.	

	Discussion **Line 124 …** it is written that hyphema occured during cataract surgery in this case; where as in line 82 (case report) it is written as phaco surgery was "without complications". Therefore, this point should be mentioned in case report also in line 82. **Lines 125, 126** … do not convey any meaning related to this case . Therefore, it is better to remove them. **Line 127 …** the words 'after surgery' should be written as "post operative". **Line 135 …** the word "In" should be added in the beginning of this sentence. Line 137 … the words 'phacoemulsification" should be added before 'cataract surgery' words. **References** **No 2** … the language of this text book is not English. Therefore, it is better to remove it. Then, the serial number of references should be adjusted in the text as well as in references. **References 5, 7, 8, 9, 10** are not quoted anywhere in the text of the paper. *They must be written either in the introduction or in the discussion.*	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	This case report is well supported with photos.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Sagili Chandrasekhara Reddy**
Department, University & Country	**Department of Ophthalmology, National Defence University of Malaysia, Malaysia**