



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_OR_5564
Title of the Manuscript:	Double malignancy manifesting as unilateral proptosis
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors need to be more explicit on their intention for this report. 1. Are they reporting double malignancy in this patient? Which means one in the orbit and the other in the abdomen? 2. Is it double malignancy in the orbit? If so, they have to convince the readers of this. This report has not said this however.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	line 23 and 83 'through systemic examination' should be corrected to read thorough systemic examination	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	authors should convince the readers what the title suggests	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer