



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_7026
Title of the Manuscript:	Dendriiform patterns associated with Herpes Zoster Ophthalmicus Ophthalmoplegia
Type of the Article	Case Report

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	There are numerous grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript which makes it uninteresting. What was the prodromal phase of HZO in the man? Which eye was involved? The clinical detail is inadequate. Was there a previous history of chickenpox, coldsores, surgeries or allergies? What were physical examination findings? Did he have cervical or auricular lymphadenopathy? Was the tip of his nose involved? Was the nasociliary nerve affected? What was visual acuity in both eyes? Over how long (duration) did he have all these ophthalmoscopic features? Line 72- requires no subheading for Treatment of keratouveitis. Which antiglaucoma drugs did he receive? Figure 1 and its legend should be below the photographs	We would like to thank the reviewer for his comments. We have corrected the manuscript for grammatical errors. Reviewer: What was the prodromal phase of HZO in the man? Which eye was involved?, clinical details are inadequate. Comment: We would like to thank the reviewer for the comments; we have added the details of the clinical manifestations from the onset of herpes zoster ophthalmicus to onset of ophthalmoplegia to keratouveitis. We have in addition provided a table of chronological events at each presentation. Reviewer: What were physical examination findings? Did he have cervical or auricular lymphadenopathy? Was the tip of his nose involved? Comment: There was no preauricular or cervical lymphadenopathy. There was no involvement of the tip of the nose. This clarification is added to the text in the line 65 Reviewer: Was the nasociliary nerve affected? Comment: At the initial presentation, except for punctate corneal erosions, there were no other signs of involvement. Reviewer: What was visual acuity in both eyes? Comment: Visual acuity was 20/30 in the right eye and 20/40 in the left eye at the initial presentation. This clarification is added to the



SDI Review Form 1.6

		text. Reviewer: Over how long (duration) did he have all these ophthalmoscopic features? Comment: The patient had been followed up for 28 months from the day of initial presentation. Reviewer: Line 72- requires no subheading for Treatment of keratouveitis. Comment: We have removed the heading. Reviewer: Which antiglaucoma drugs did he receive? Comment: The patient received topical timolol 0.5%bd, brimonidine 0.15%bd and dorzolamide 2% tds. Details of antiglaucoma treatment are reflected in table 1. Reviewer: Figure 1 and its legend should be below the photographs Comment: We have made changes appropriately.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Introduction section is too scant. Reference 1 in maintext (Line 32) is out of order. That sentence requires no reference. Lines 87 and 88...the role of topical antivirals and steroids are well established.	Reviewer: Introduction section is too scant Comment: We have revamped the introduction from line 48-56. Reviewer: Reference 1 in maintext (Line 32) is out of order. Comment: We have removed the reference and the sentence. Reviewer: Lines 87 and 88...the role of topical antivirals and steroids are well established. Comment: We agree with the reviewer.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This case report requires major revision.	We have done a major revision including all the details.