



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_5295
Title of the Manuscript:	Panophthalmitis masquerading as ocular melanoma-an eye opener
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	1. Page 3 lines 95-96: unclear statement, clarification of the second half of the statement is needed.	The author of the article writes “Uveal melanoma is the most common primary malignant intraocular neoplasm of Caucasian adults. Uveal melanomas have an overall mortality of about 30-50% within 10 years from initial diagnosis and treatment. Deaths are mostly secondary to distant metastases. Hence, the importance of having a high suspicion of this entity, especially in blind eyes with no fundus view.
Minor REVISION comments	1. Page 1 line 13: “seclusiopupillae” should be two words seclusion pupillae, and insert comma after pupillae 2. Page 1 line 14: “Computerised” should be either Computerized or Computed. 3. SPECT CT should initially be described as Single-photon emission computed tomography. 4. Page 2 line 51: “with in” should be one word. 5. Page 2 line 53: “seclusio” should have one “c” 6. Page 2 line 73: “Rhemuatoid” should be Rheumatoid 7. Page 2 line 75: grammar should be corrected 8. Page 3 lines 98-99: commas needed 9. Page 3 line 102: misspelling of seclusio	Complied with and changed in the manuscript



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Recommend some reworking of the paragraphs under the discussion	