

PART 1:	
Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_4127
Title of the Manuscript:	Retinal astrocytoma: a supportive finding in Tuberous sclerosis

PART 2:	
FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
I've revised the new version of the manuscript and found no many differences with that previously submitted. First of all, I comprehend that this pathology is rare in Nepal and could be worthful to decscribe it, but it could be better to include in title a sentence such (the experience of a Nepal cebter... or somethinh similar) The manuscript should have been revised by a native speaker. The introduction has been shorten, but my comments have not led to the advised changes: line 38 has not been corrected, I don't think that subependymal giant astrocitoma could be called amartoma lines 59-62 have not been corrected lines 66-68: I adviced to move them to the discussion section. The sentence has been removed but it doesn't appear in the appropriate section. Cases: lines 102-105 have been only partially modified. Line 137: has not been corrected line 139: has not been corrected Discussion lines 145-148: the sentence has been removed but has not been replaced lines 149-150: the sentence has been only partially modified. The author declares the discussion has been lenghten, but the previuosly submitted 19 lines has been reduced to 18	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer