



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_10274
Title of the Manuscript:	A Retrospective Case Study of the Incidence of Endogenous Fungal Endophthalmitis in Patients with Positive Blood Cultures for Systemic Fungemia: Review of the Literature
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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	1. Since this was a retrospective study, we cannot be sure of the true incidence of ocular involvement or the spectrum of organisms. What was the spectrum of organisms in the patients that did not receive eye exams? Was this different from that of patients receiving eye exams? 2. Line 104: for clarity, should be "more recently published incidence rates". 3. What were the frequencies of retinal findings on examination? Hemorrhages? Cotton wool spots? 4. Of greatest interest may be the authors' recommendations for screening. As written they generate a couple of questions. a. The authors recommend examining patients with visual symptoms. The only patient in this study with endophthalmitis did not have visual symptoms. Can the authors provide	1. Unfortunately, we only reviewed charts of patients who underwent eye examinations, thus we do not have a list of fungal organisms in patients who did not receive eye exams. 2. Done 3. Only 3 patients (including the one patient dx with fungal endophthalmitis) had retinal findings. Please see lines 95-97. 4. A – attempted to address in lines 149-158, please see manuscript B – further clarification added



SDI Review Form 1.6

	data from other published studies to support this recommendation? b. They recommend examining patients who are “critically ill”. This describes most patients with positive fungal cultures. Do you mean patients with documented end-organ infection? Or high fevers? Please define better.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		