



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b><u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u></b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_BJMMR_19161</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Idiopathic necrotizing scleritis, anterior uveitis, and localized retinal detachment</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case Study</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>I carefully reviewed the paper entitle: Idiopathic necrotizing scleritis, anterior uveitis, and localized retinal detachment. The paper described a 74 year old man with necrotizing scleritis and of uncertain diagnosis. The authors have written quite well the case although there are some comments that I would like my do, for authors to clarify.</p> <p>Although there is no firm rule where to place the brackets when mentioned in the text, first a word abbreviations; it is suggested to place the parentheses to the abbreviation and not to the word itself. I think that the authors undertake appropriate changes in the text.</p> <p>On figure 1 the authors may want to add more description to of the scleral changes to the legend as the image is good.</p> <p>The authors say that the origin of scleritis is not viral despite lab results showing: HSV1IgM 0.11 (&lt;0.8) and HSV1IgG 69.51IU / L (&lt;16). With the following argument: "Based on various Virological results it Could not be Said That the disease is of viral etiology, and so additional Consultations Were Made." Authors could mention that other viral results made them discard the viral etiology. Authors could mention that other viral results made them discard the viral etiology. especially that the patient was given treatment and worsened as described in the following month. Or if he was given treatment, the authors must mention in the text.</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>Did authors asked for Chest, sinus, sacroiliac, limb joint x-rays that can help in the diagnosis of arthritis, Wegener’s disease, tuberculosis? Did authors look associations with gout, TB, syphilis?</p> <p>No either local or systemic therapy visits in June and July. The reader must assume that the authors did not get any treatment? Please I suggest to authors a more detail description of retinal (exudative, rhegmatogenous, extension ..etc) and corneal precipitates. Legend should be more explicit in Figure 2. During Agust visit authors mentioned : "Both systemic corticosteroid and nonsteroidal local and systemic therapy was applied". Please mention kind of steroid and nonsteroidal used as well as the doses.</p> <p>Legend should be more explicit in Figure 3. In the Pathoanatomical images (figures 4,5 and 6) should please expand the explanation of what you see in the Figures, even authors may mention the type of staining.</p> <p>Please describe laser intervention.</p> <p>According to the general guidelines of the journal, the structure must be the case study: Aims, Presentation of Case, Discussion and Conclusion. No Aim it is more like an introduction. Maybe I should be shorter. No conclusion in the text after the discussion.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jose D Luna</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Privado de Ojos Romagosa and Fundacion VER, Argentina</b>