



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_4127
Title of the Manuscript:	Retinal astrocytoma: a supportive finding in Tuberous sclerosis
Type of the Article	Case study

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	I read with interest the manuscript entitled "Retinal astrocytoma: a supportive finding in Tuberous Sclerosis" by Kharel et al. The authors aim at proposing retinal astrocytoma as a guide to the diagnosis of tuberous sclerosis complex (TSC). Unfortunately, that finding is only one of the 11 major features of TSC and could not be considered as more important than the others. Retinal astrocytoma could be found in 3 to 100% of TSC population; on the contrary, retinal astrocytoma without TSC is quite rare. The manuscript should have been revised by a native speaker; actually, it contains an excessive number of errors. The introduction is too long and the discussion too short, and both contain some inappropriate sentences	Report of Tuberous Sclerosis from developing countries like ours have rarely been done. Hence we found it very worthful to report. It has been revised by a native speaker and the correction of the errors has be done/ The introduction is shorten, discussion is lengthen and inappropriate sentences removed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: conclusion: it seems more appropriate to affirm that retinal phakomatosis aids in confirming TSC instead of “ruling out” Introduction: line 38: the so called SEGAs (subependymal giant astrocytomas) have to be large at least 10 mm... the author probably means subependymal periventricular nodules. Lines 59-62: this sentence is inappropriate, it doesn’t add anything useful. Line 66-68: it seems more appropriate to move it to the discussion Presentation of cases: Lines 102-105: these sentence seems redundant and should be removed. Line 137: it seems strange that the diagnosis of TSC has been made only after the ophthalmoscopy Line 139: follow-up cannot be based only on ophthalmoscopy Discussion: Lines 145-148: this sentence is incomprehensible Lines 149-150: inappropriate and not useful	Correction done Corrections done.
---------------------------------------	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I think this study doesn't add anything to the knowledge about TSC.	