



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_10334
Title of the Manuscript:	Osteogenic Osteosarcoma of the Orbit: a case report
Type of the Article	Case Study

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The metastatic work up in the patients with Osteosarcoma include a Bone scan, which was not done	No metastasis was found during a radionuclide bone scan. The manuscript now corrected to 'No metastasis was found during a radionuclide bone scan, chest, abdominal, and pelvis CT scans.'
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	May refer to " Int Ophthalmol. 2008 Dec;28(6):433-6. Epub 2007 Oct 23 " for discussion on the management of the same. Adding discussion of management is preferred	The comment is appreciated. But article that you referred is about orbital metastasis (a rare presentation of osteosarcoma.) but no metastasis was found in our case. Because of this we don't discuss orbital metastatic osteosarcomas. The study concentrated on primary orbital osteosarcoma.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Well written, and can be accepted after above two comments are addressed	